



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2015

No. 18

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 3, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

EXPAND AND IMPROVE ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, too many people in our country—the richest country in the history of the world—are hungry, and it is a sad reality. Hunger has many faces: children, seniors, veterans, the disabled. One group that experiences hunger and is often overlooked is working families.

Millions of people who work for a living don't earn enough to ensure that

their families have enough to eat. They don't earn enough to ensure that their kids have access to quality child care. For millions of working families, every single day is a struggle. We in this Chamber ought to do more to help.

In his State of the Union Address, I was pleased to see the President identify specific ways to support working families: tripling the child care tax credit; increasing the number of slots available and investing in high-quality, affordable child care programs. These are investments that are important to all families but especially working and poor families.

We know that the early years of a child's life are critical to shaping healthy cognitive, social, and emotional development. Ensuring that all of our young children have an opportunity to thrive in a safe, nurturing environment is one of the best economic investments that we can make. It is the right thing to do, and it pays huge dividends later on.

Families at all income levels know how expensive child care is today. In 2013, the cost of full-time care for an infant in a child care center was about \$10,000 per year, more than the cost of in-state college tuition in many States, and many of the best child care programs cost more than that.

For poor families, the cost of quality child care can be an untenable burden. For these families, it may mean being forced to choose between paying rent, getting medicine, or buying food.

No parent should find themselves in the difficult situation of having to drop their child off at a program that is unsafe or of poor quality just so they can get to their job. Parents shouldn't have to choose between safe child care and keeping their job to pay the bills. For poor families in particular, it is a daily struggle to balance everything and still make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the Census Bureau released figures that showed

that one in five children in this country received food stamps last year. Let me repeat that. One in five children relied on SNAP. That is 16 million children who relied on SNAP to keep them from going hungry last year, more than at the start of the Great Recession.

We know that our economy is improving slowly, but the gains aren't shared evenly among all Americans. Too many poor and working families are still struggling to make ends meet. We know that despite some of the false rhetoric, the majority of SNAP participants who are expected to work and are able to work, in fact, work.

Families with children have even higher rates of employment than other households on SNAP. More than 60 percent of families with children receiving SNAP have someone in the household working.

Mr. Speaker, these families have a working adult but still make so little that they qualify for SNAP. Without SNAP, these families would not be able to put enough nutritious food on the table for their children and for themselves.

Being poor is hard, and it is expensive. We should do everything we can to support working families. Expanding and investing in child care is an important step toward achieving that goal.

I urge the Republican leadership to support the President's initiatives to expand and improve access to high-quality, affordable child care programs. At the same time, I urge the Republican leadership—I plead with them—to refrain from cutting food and nutrition programs that are essential to a child's healthy development.

It is the right thing to do to support these families, to support food and nutrition programs, to support quality child care programs. It is the right thing to do for all American families. It is especially the right thing to do for our low-income families who have not

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H707

shared in recent economic improvements and who face tough choices every day.

Families should not be forced to choose between good, safe child care and putting food on the table. That is a false choice; and, quite frankly, in this country, it is shameful that they have to make that choice.

I urge my colleagues to make a renewed commitment to end hunger now. We have the resources, we have the food, we have everything, but we lack the political will.

Hunger is a political condition. We can solve this problem in a bipartisan way if we choose to, if we make it a priority. There are millions and millions of our citizens who are depending on us to do more than we are doing now. I hope that we live up to that challenge. We can and we should do much better.

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the controversies gripping Congress, certainly, we should all be able to agree that the full faith and credit of the United States should not hang in the balance every time there is a fiscal debate in Washington.

This Nation now staggers under \$18 trillion of debt, nearly \$7.5 trillion of it run up during this administration. The interest on that debt is one of the fastest growing components of the Federal budget.

If there is ever any doubt of the security or reliability of that debt owed by this government, interest rates would quickly rise, and our precarious budget situation could rapidly spin out of control.

Ernest Hemingway put it this way. He asked:

How do you go bankrupt? Two ways. First gradually, then suddenly.

So it is with nations.

The debt limit is how we regulate the Nation's debt. It is the national equivalent of a credit card limit. That limit has to be periodically adjusted. It is appropriate for Congress to take responsibility when it is raised. When it is raised, it is also appropriate for Congress to review and revise the policies that are driving that debt.

The fundamental problem under both Democratic and Republican Congresses is that this process is fraught with controversy—the bigger the debt, the bigger the controversy; the bigger the controversy, the more credit markets are likely to be spooked into demanding higher interest payments to meet their greater risk. Given the size of our debt, that could produce an interest tidal wave that could sink our budget and our Nation along with it.

I am, today, introducing the Default Prevention Act with 43 cosponsors to guarantee that the sovereign debt of

the United States Government will be paid in full and on time, under any circumstances, even total political gridlock.

It simply provides that if the debt limit is reached, the Treasury Secretary may continue to borrow above that limit for the sole purpose of paying interest and principal that is due. It is an absolute guarantee that the debt of the United States will be honored.

Most States have various laws to guarantee payment of their debts. Three years ago, in testimony to the Senate, Ben Bernanke praised these State provisions for maintaining confidence in their bonds.

This act passed the House in the 113th Congress, but it was never taken up by the Senate. Now, we are approaching the expiration of the government's current borrowing authority. We will soon have serious discussions over the level of our debt and the additional measures necessary to bring that debt under control. We all hope these discussions will go smoothly, but we all know that sometimes they don't.

The Default Prevention Act says loudly and clearly to the world that no matter how much we may differ and quarrel, the sovereign debt of this Nation is guaranteed, and their loans to this government are absolutely safe.

Last session, the Democrats opposed this measure, charging that it is an excuse not to pay our other bills. Do they actually suggest that all these other States—that have guaranteed their sovereign debts for generations, some for centuries—have ever used these guarantees as an excuse not to pay their other bills?

On the contrary—by providing clear and unambiguous mandates to protect their credit first, they actually support and maintain their ability to pay for all of their other obligations.

The most outrageous claim the Democrats made was that this measure paid China first. What nonsense. More than half of our debt is held by Americans, often in American pension funds. This act actually protects Americans far more than Chinese or other foreign investors.

Whether our loans come from China or Timbuktu, from Grandma's pension fund or Johnny's savings bond, without the Nation's credit, we cannot meet any of our other obligations.

Principled disputes over how the debt limit is addressed are going to happen from time to time. Just a few years ago, then-Senator Barack Obama vigorously opposed an increase in the debt limit sought by the Bush administration.

When these controversies erupt, as they inevitably do in a free society, it is imperative that credit markets are supremely confident that their loans to the United States are secure.

Providing such a guarantee could prevent a future debt crisis and give Congress the calm it needs to negotiate

the changes that must be made to bring our debt under control before Congress authorizes still more debt.

I urge its speedy consideration.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is the week where the President submits his budget. We are seeing a great deal of conversation about many of the provisions. One area that I am pleased has been greeted with positive reaction is his emphasis on infrastructure, on rebuilding and renewing America.

This is a debate that is very important. It is long overdue to focus in on solutions. It is an area of potential agreement: the need to address the fact that America is falling apart while we are falling behind, somewhere on the order of 25th in the world rankings. Where once we had the finest infrastructure in the world, that is no longer the case.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives us a grade of "D." It is going to cost \$2.2 trillion by 2020 to be able to bring us up to standard. The longer we wait, the worse the situation.

It is costing each American \$323 a year, on average, in damage to their cars because of inadequate infrastructure, to say nothing of thousands of lives lost because of unsafe road conditions and the potential disruption of business and commerce.

Americans are spending millions of hours a year trapped in traffic. America's highways—which are how we deliver products to stores, to factories—are increasingly congested, causing increased costs due to delay.

The President's proposal is a bit complicated. It deals with other tax provisions that virtually everybody thinks are a long shot, at best, to be enacted.

□ 1015

This is part of the pattern the administration has had in the past: offering up things that, in theory, would make a difference but that are unlikely. Usually they are pronounced dead on arrival. Likewise, the proposals of some of my Republican friends for their approaches, wrapping it into their version of tax reform, have been consistently declared not possible.

We have one, simple, commonsense approach that should be taken—it was highlighted again today in an editorial in *The Washington Post*. It has also been written about in *The New York Times*, in the *LA Times*, in *USA Today*, in *Bloomberg View*, in papers large and small across the country—to raise the gas tax. It has not been raised in 22 years, and in that time, it has lost a significant portion of the purchasing power while America's needs grow.

For 60 years, the gas tax has formed the backbone of how we deal with

America's infrastructure finance. The user pays—people who benefit the most pay the most—and it served us well for over half a century.

But over the course of the last 10 years, it is no longer adequate. The fixed amount that hasn't been increased, the erosion due to inflation, increasing the fuel efficiency of vehicles all combine to mean that we are falling short of the mark. We have been required to transfer over \$60 billion from the general fund just to maintain our already inadequate levels of funding, and the current patch expires in May. The clock is ticking. There are opportunities to make a difference.

It is interesting. It is not just the newspaper editorial writers who focus on this as the simplest, most effective, commonsense approach. We are finding in the other body a number of Senators, including Republican Senators, who indicate that they are open to finally addressing and updating the gas tax.

My colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, JIM RENACCI from Ohio, wrote a very insightful article in a recent issue of Roll Call. He made the case for our moving forward with increasing the user fee to be able to maintain our roads and bridges, highlighting the costs and consequences.

Mr. Speaker, there is an opportunity for us to move forward. This does not have to be something that is complicated or partisan. This is something that Ronald Reagan in 1982 called upon the Congress to do, where he in his Thanksgiving Day address asked for the Congress to more than double the gas tax. Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan did it. We can do it today. I strongly urge my colleagues to address this simple, commonsense approach and help us rebuild and renew America.

THE VALUE OF VACCINATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I feel compelled to speak again about the necessity of increasing the knowledge and the notice given by the FDA—the Food and Drug Administration—and the Centers for Disease Control on what seems to be a surge in the getting of measles by many across this country. The numbers have gone past 100. It is clear that measles is a disease that quickly spreads, and it is also clear that medical science affirms the value of vaccines.

So I believe it is extremely important today to again ask the FDA and the CDC, as I did yesterday in a letter, to raise the level of warning and concern to parents, schools, counties, and States in the entire Nation on being able to provide information to encourage vaccination, if that is what is the ability to have—if you are the age or if your child is of the age to be able to receive that vaccination and to do so.

Over the last couple of weeks, we have seen measles spread to enormous

numbers. We have seen the numbers grow in California and then spread. We have heard of cases in which the measles started in an entertainment facility, and people moved around the country. One example, in particular, I think, is potent because the father of the children has been speaking out. He is a pediatrician, and he is calling upon families to vaccinate, particularly the MMR, which is the vaccination dealing with measles.

Unfortunately, an innocent visit to a clinic, which a child needs to do for pediatric services, exposed an 8-month-old to the possibility of measles and exposed his 3-year-old sister, who is suffering from leukemia. Now, as I understand it, they are in isolation. There is the thought of someone traveling on an airplane with measles. Unlike a number of other diseases, measles spreads extremely quickly. Stories have been told or examples have been given that if you have measles and if you are in a room and if you leave that room—and maybe you have coughed or done something—an hour later, someone comes in, and there is the possibility that you still may be exposed to it. When riding on an airplane, you may expose a whole number of persons to measles if you are, in fact, infected.

I think it is extremely important. Though we realize there are differences of opinion, I am glad to find in the political landscape that this is not a political football and that, in essence, we come together and recognize the importance of having this information and of encouraging vaccination.

I am asking for the State and city health departments and county health departments across the Nation to provide their own information to parents and schools. I wonder whether or not there is need to again reassess the importance of reinstating the obligation and the responsibility of all families who have children who are going into a public school system to have them vaccinated within the realm of their own health conditions and their own assessments by their pediatricians.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue. This is an issue of which we in a modern day, 21st century nation—and as an example of health care to those around the world—need to show the importance of preventative medicine and protecting our children. We have worked on these issues in many ways. We have fought for a vaccine for HIV. As has been said in the past, they are looking for a vaccine for Ebola because we understand how that can intervene and, in those instances, save lives. In this instance, in not knowing the condition of individuals, we know that this disease can be damaging.

It is important that we focus on educating the public. I believe an alert should go out that we have a problem and that we should be working with our local health facilities and disciplines and districts to be able to establish best practices and protocols, and that parents and others should be informed to make intelligent decisions.

More importantly, I think this is an issue that should be quickly assessed on behalf of the CDC and the FDA. Mr. Speaker, it is important for the children of America that we provide them the safety and security for their lives.

FIFTY YEARS FROM SELMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in one of his great books, Martin Luther King, Jr., asked the question: Where do we go from here—chaos or community?

Mr. Speaker, today, 50 years after Selma, that question is still in need of an answer.

One area in need of aggressive action is persistent poverty, and I want to thank President Obama for sending us a budget that equalizes the Tax Code and that, if substantially enacted, will move us closer to what Dr. King often referred to as the “beloved community.”

Statistics show that there are nearly 500 counties and thousands of communities in the United States that are classified by the Census Bureau as “persistent-poverty areas.” They are certified because 20 percent of their populations have lived below the poverty line for the last 30 or more years. They are diverse communities, including Caucasian communities in States like West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee; Native American communities in States like South Dakota, Alaska, and Oklahoma; Latino communities in States like Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas; and African American communities in States like South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. They are urban communities in States like New York and heartland communities in States like Missouri.

There are 139 of these counties that are represented in this House by Democrats, 331 by Republicans, and 18 are split between the two parties. Combating persistent poverty should matter to all of us regardless of party, geography, or race.

In early 2009, as we were putting together the Recovery Act, I proposed language to require at least 10 percent of funds in three rural development accounts to be directed to efforts in these persistent-poverty counties. This requirement was enacted into law. In light of the definition of “persistent-poverty counties” as having at least 20 percent poverty rates over 30 years, this provision became known as the “10-20-30 initiative.”

In using the 10-20-30 formula, the Recovery Act funded a total of 4,655 projects in persistent-poverty counties, totaling nearly \$1.7 billion. I saw firsthand the positive effects of these projects in my district. We were able to undertake projects and create jobs that would have otherwise languished. Among these investments were a \$5.8 million grant and a \$2 million loan to

construct 51 miles of water lines in the rural community of Brittons Neck in Marion County, South Carolina.

There are many other success stories. In Lowndes County, Mississippi, \$17.5 million was spent to install a water line, elevator tank, and two wastewater pump stations, providing potable water to rural Mississippians and creating badly needed construction jobs.

In 2011, I joined with our former Republican colleague, Representative Jo Ann Emerson of Missouri, to introduce an amendment to the continuing resolution that would have continued 10–20–30 for rural development and would have expanded it to 11 additional accounts throughout the Federal budget to enhance economic development, education, job training, health, justice, the environment, and much more.

I want to make one thing clear about the 10–20–30 approach. It does not add one dime to the deficit. It simply targets resources from funds already authorized or appropriated.

Over the past 30 years, the national economy has risen and fallen multiple times. During these economic downturns, we have been rightly focused on getting our economy, as a whole, on track. We have not given adequate attention to these communities that are suffering from chronic distress and Depression-era levels of joblessness.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that, as we undertake this budget, we will find ways to work together to move our Nation closer to Dr. King's dream of a beloved community.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, thank You for giving us another day.

All of Congress today remembers the heroic sacrifices and accomplishments of the First Special Service Force of World War II when Americans and Canadians formed for the first time a combined unit trained to be a small, elite corps capable of accomplishing the seemingly impossible.

May their story be an inspiration to the Members of this people's House where a similar cooperative effort toward a shared common goal appears all too often to be seemingly impossible.

We ask, O God, that all who populate these hallways this day be possessed of goodwill, appreciative of the great exploits of so many of our American ancestors.

And may all that is said and done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Obama released his budget. Unfortunately, it is right out of the liberals' tax-and-spend playbook.

Apparently, the President thinks that since he has already added \$7.5 trillion to America's record \$18 trillion debt, what is \$8.5 trillion more?

As chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, I am also concerned that President Obama has once again ignored the grim finances of Social Security, and that is a shame because we cannot keep kicking the can down the road. It is just not fair or right to the millions of hardworking Americans who have paid into Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what Obama likes to say in his speeches, too many Americans are still struggling. The last thing this country needs is more taxes, more spending, and more debt.

Americans want, need, and deserve better.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, the President put forward his budget. Now, this House has an opportunity to put forward one of our own that reflects the values of those we represent.

We have a choice. We can embrace and support the President's budget that lifts all Americans up, or we can pass another House Republican budget that keeps Americans down.

In California's East Bay, access to child care is going down while costs go up. Access to education has been reduced while costs go up for those who are lucky enough to get in. Paychecks are going down while everyday costs around us are going up.

With this budget, we can address and fix these problems for the families we represent. We can expand access to child care and cut taxes for families paying child care. We can pass and expand access to community colleges with tuition-free community colleges. We can see paycheck progress by making investments in transportation and infrastructure.

We have a choice. Pass the House Republican budget which will keep families down, or we can lift America up and provide more opportunity for everyone with this President's budget.

PUNXSUTAWNEY, PENNSYLVANIA, CELEBRATES 129TH ANNUAL GROUNDHOG DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the town of Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, held its 129th annual Groundhog Day celebration.

Each year, I am honored to be a part of this celebration, being in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, but a snowstorm moving across the region forced me back down to Washington sooner than expected.

Punxsutawney Phil was awakened from his burrow yesterday at 7:28 in the morning and, despite overcast skies, saw his shadow and predicted 6 more weeks of winter.

Groundhog Day is not only about Phil's prediction of the future and how soon the next season will be upon us; it is a celebration of our past, the Commonwealth heritage, and a time for

communities to come together and carry on this great tradition for generations to come.

It is truly an honor to have this celebration take place in my home district, and I want to thank President Bill Deely of the Groundhog Club Inner Circle and everyone from Punxsutawney and the surrounding area for their hard work and planning to make this year's Groundhog Day such a special event.

LET EPA DO ITS JOB AND PROTECT OUR WATER

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, from the shores of the Delaware and the banks of the Allegheny, to the streams and the creeks that feed them, Pennsylvanians know that water is vital to our health, our recreation, and our wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, our waterways remain at risk. To protect them, the EPA is considering a rule to restore Clean Water Act protections to thousands of waterways in Pennsylvania and across the country. When finalized, this rule will mark the biggest step forward for clean water in more than a decade.

Unfortunately, polluters and their allies are now working to derail this clean water rule. They have even scheduled a rare, joint House-Senate hearing to set the stage for this dirty water attack.

I say it is time for Congress to get out of the way and let EPA do its job and protect our water, as is its charge.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the President's budget proposal which was released yesterday.

While I appreciate the President putting forth his vision for the future of our Nation, that vision is neither one that our Nation can afford, nor one that I can support.

Each year, the President brings us a budget that increases spending, raises taxes, and seeks trillions upon trillions of new debt upon our great Nation. If the Republican-led House had agreed to these budget requests, our Federal Government would be 20 percent larger today.

This year, the President's budget proposal proposes another \$8.5 trillion in deficits that will push our debt to well over \$26 trillion in the next 10 years, slowing our economy and leaving the next generation with the legacy of higher taxes and less opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, we must work together—Democrats and Republicans—to balance our budget by cutting wasteful spending, holding the line on spending increases, reforming programs, and reducing the size of government.

Kansans know and the American people know that a leaner, more efficient and effective government is critical to strengthening our economy and creating prosperity and opportunity for every American.

IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND STATE OF OUR INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROTOCOLS AT PORTS OF ENTRY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Bridge in my western New York district is the second busiest border crossing between the United States and Canada, making it essential that people and goods are able to move quickly and efficiently across the bridge. The second phase of a cargo preinspection pilot project at the Peace Bridge recently concluded and is currently under evaluation.

While I have confidence that the bill will call for expansion of preinspection at the Peace Bridge, the pilot revealed several challenges which create delays and require immediate attention.

Internet speeds on the Canadian side of the bridge exceed those on the American side, enabling faster screening. Radiation detectors on the American side are older and often inaccurate, resulting in false negatives that create delays. Finally, empty trucks are not required to provide a manifest, resulting in unnecessary secondary inspections for empty vehicles.

Last week, I wrote to Secretary Jeh Johnson highlighting the urgent need to rectify these issues. We must improve the quality and state of the infrastructure and protocols at ports of entry across the country.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER for appointing me to serve as the Republican cochair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. It is a great honor to serve as a voice defending the rights of people worldwide to live free of repression and violence.

I have served as a member of the Commission since its establishment following the passing of our dear colleague Congressman Lantos. A Holocaust survivor, he understood what it was like to live under the thumb of a brutal and oppressive regime.

While we vowed "never again," today, hundreds of millions of people worldwide live under governments that restrict the rights of free speech and religious expression—regimes that persecute minorities, women, and children.

We are blessed to live in a country where individual rights are protected

and cherished. Despite our differences, Democrats and Republicans work hand in hand to protect these rights at home and expand them worldwide.

I am particularly honored to share the leadership of the Commission with Congressman MCGOVERN. We have worked together to promote human rights for many years now, and I think there is much we can accomplish together.

REPEALING OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT FOR THE 56TH TIME

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, with all that we should be doing to help address middle class anxiety, to help the economy along, to help with student debt, to help with the challenges that all of our constituents face, what will we be doing this week? We will be repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 56th time—56.

I get it. The first couple of times, Mr. Speaker, I get it. The first couple of times, the Republicans believed that this was a government takeover of health care, that there were death panels, that it was unconstitutional, that it would raise costs in the health care section, that it would be a job killer. None of that turned out to be true.

In fact, the opposite turned out to be true. The Supreme Court said it was constitutional, it actually helped lower costs in the overall health care system, and we are now adding jobs in the private sector faster than we have added them in 10 years.

None of that was true.

What is true is that the Affordable Care Act has given 10 million or more Americans the security for the first time of having health insurance. It has cut the uninsured rate in my State of Connecticut in half.

Do you know what that means? It means that Ann Christman—51 years old, a single mother, could never afford health care insurance—now, she has it. She went to a doctor, and her breast cancer was diagnosed early. She said:

The cancer has been detected at a very early stage, which, with a 98 percent survival rate, has saved my life.

Respectfully, let's leave it alone.

AMERICA DESERVES AN EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT THAT SOLVES OUR NATION'S PROBLEMS

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, a huge congratulations to the New England Patriots for winning Super Bowl XLIX—surgical passes from quarterback Tom Brady, a thunderous spike by tight end Rob Gronkowski, and a

crucial goal line interception by rookie cornerback Malcolm Butler.

Although our Patriots earned a thrilling fourth Super Bowl title, I also congratulate the Seattle Seahawks and their fans for battling until the very end of their terrific season.

Maine is Patriots nation. We appreciate hard work and results. In this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats engage in passionate debate on issues critically important to American families. We have been sent here to move the ball down the field together, to put points on the board for hardworking taxpayers.

Patriots fans, Seahawks fans, and families coast to coast deserve an effective government that solves our Nation's problems. Then we will have a healthy, growing economy with more jobs, fatter paychecks, and more freedom.

Here in this Chamber, we are all Patriots, we are all Americans, and we work for the people.

□ 1215

RICK ORLOV

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have love-hate relationships with the news media and with various reporters, but today I wanted to rise and express my condolences for a reporter in Los Angeles whom we mostly had a love relationship with and very little hate.

Rick Orlov was a reporter for the Daily News, and he covered Los Angeles City Hall for almost 30 years. I served on the Los Angeles City Council for 10 of those, so I got to know him well.

Do you know what? He earned everyone's respect. Somehow, he made no enemies. Rick was a true newsman, and he focused on writing the news that mattered. He was not interested in gotcha reporting. His longstanding institutional knowledge allowed him to understand and tell the whole story.

Rick Orlov was not only a great reporter, but he was a great man. I considered him my friend, and he really was a piece of Los Angeles. His death is a huge loss for the city and for all of us who had a chance to know him.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. TROTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, the President presented his budget yesterday, and I am disappointed to say that it is just more of the same tax-and-spend policies that we have seen over the past 6 years—\$4 trillion of spending, \$2 trillion in new taxes, and more deficits for the next 10 years.

I have only been in Washington for a month, but the prevailing message

from the President seems to be that politicians know better than the people, that Big Government is the solution, and that huge deficits are just part of life. This experiment has failed and has hurt the hardworking taxpayers in my district, who built our economy. Since 2009, the debt has grown from \$10 trillion to \$18 trillion. The new budget has the debt at \$26 trillion in 10 years, and interest payments alone on our national debt will quadruple in the next 10 years.

Now more than ever we need a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution. It is a simple concept: force the Federal Government to live within its means. Families do it; businesses do it; cities, counties, and States are doing it. I urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of House Joint Resolutions 1 and 2.

FULLY FUND THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, this month, in a very short period of time, the Department of Homeland Security is going to run out of money. Our enemies, they plot, they plan to do us harm, and this Republican majority in this Congress refuses to give the Department of Homeland Security the full funding they need to keep us safe. What we will do this week is the 56th repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, some in this Chamber may be willing to cater to their base for political reasons, but catering to our enemies in order to cater to the base is unacceptable.

Making it easier for our enemies to attack and do us harm by refusing to fund the Department of Homeland Security so you can score points with your base over a difference you may have with the President on an executive order is not what the American people want, expect, or deserve.

The contrast could not be more clear, Mr. Speaker. There is one party in this House that is willing to undermine our homeland security and to undermine the middle class' economic security. There is another that wants to strengthen both.

OVERTIME

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my support for America's middle class.

Currently, government rules allow for only 11 percent of salaried workers to be eligible for overtime pay. Contrast that to 1975, when the income threshold for overtime pay covered 65 percent of our salaried workers. This is because Department of Labor rules pro-

hibit workers who earn more than \$23,660 a year from earning overtime pay.

Recently, I was joined by more than 30 of my colleagues in calling for this administration to raise the income threshold to \$69,000. At this level, we could cover the same number of workers who were eligible in 1975. For 35 years, American workers have increased their productivity, yet they have not been rewarded. Let's remember that it is a strong middle class that drives economic growth.

Be bold, Mr. President. Your administration can help middle class families. Raise the income threshold for overtime pay.

A COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR ALL

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, making higher education available to everyone has to be a top priority, and the President's budget makes a major commitment to increasing access to high-quality education from preschool through college, particularly at our Nation's community colleges. With the high cost of attending a 4-year institution, community college is often a viable option to so many driven students who are seeking a higher degree without incurring overwhelming debt.

In the President's addresses, he addresses the challenges that so many students face today. In his proposal, his budget makes 2 years of high-quality community college free to responsible students, saving 9 million students an average of \$3,800 a year in tuition.

In my home State of New Jersey and across the Nation, community colleges offer educational opportunities to students just beginning higher education, to people already in the workforce who are looking to gain additional training, and for the unemployed looking to change careers. The President's proposal could benefit them all and countless others for whom higher education currently seems unattainable.

I would just hope that my Republican colleagues across the aisle will join us in making sure that a college education is an attainable goal for all Americans.

GROWING OUR ECONOMY

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is week five of this new Congress, and the American people are still waiting for action to create jobs. Instead of doing that, Republicans seem focused on appeasing and pandering to the most extreme voices in their party. Even some Republicans are appalled by this Republican agenda now that they control Congress.

One Republican Member told the National Journal:

Week one, Republicans had a Speaker election that did not go well; week two, Republicans got into a big fight about deporting children; week three, Republicans are now talking about rape and incest and reportable rapes and incest for minors . . . I just can't wait for week four.

Now we are in week five, and the new Republican Congress is still working. It doesn't look like we are going to see a jobs bill or an infrastructure bill. Instead, today, for the 56th time, we will see a vote on the floor of the House to take away health care for millions of Americans.

The Republican leadership needs to stop putting the politics of the extreme rightwing of their party in the fore and get back to the work of the American people.

THE BUDGET

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to admit what people with common sense all across America have known for years: mindless austerity just does not work. It doesn't grow the economy, it does not add jobs, and it doesn't unleash anything except misery.

The sequester was a bad idea from the start. The country needs to embrace its can-do spirit, and Congress has to stop saying: "Sorry, we just can't."

The President's budget is tailor-made to help hardworking middle class families get ahead. It will invest in education, strengthen workers' skills, provide tax relief for the middle class, and rebuild our infrastructure. This is exactly what we need to build on the record of the 58 months of job growth we are experiencing and to make sure that everyone shares in the gains of our growing economy.

FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL UNIVERSITY

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, to celebrate Black History Month, I rise to recognize Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, one of the oldest and most prestigious Historically Black Colleges in the United States.

The Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, or "FAMU," as it is more affectionately known in north Florida, was founded in 1887 with just 15 students and two instructors. Today, the university has grown to enroll nearly 10,000 students, and it was named by the U.S. News & World Report as the top public Historically Black College or university in the Nation for 2015.

I am proud to represent FAMU in the Second Congressional District of Florida. Their mission and the public serv-

ice they provide is a benefit to north Florida, to our State, and to our Nation.

OBAMACARE HAS WON

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is working. Here is what I hear:

Women can afford to get pregnant because maternity is covered. Parents sleep better because their children are covered up to age 26. People with pre-existing conditions are no longer terrified that they are going to be uninsured. Small businesses are saving money. Doctors and nurses are saving lives because patients can come to them. In Illinois, over 700,000 individuals are newly insured, and we are not even through with enrollment.

As the President said in this Chamber 2 weeks ago: "That is good news, people."

But, today, we have gone back to the Republican old song book—yet another vote to repeal ObamaCare. Let me warn them that they do this at their peril. Tens of millions of Americans, many insured for the first time and others who can finally afford insurance, will not give it up without a fight.

Let's hope the 56th time of a vote to repeal will be the last so we can get to the real work of raising wages and creating good jobs and passing equal pay and of comprehensive immigration reform and improving retirement security and passing a renewed Voting Rights Act. The war against ObamaCare is over, and ObamaCare has won.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 596, REPEAL OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 70 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 70

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 596) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respec-

tive chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 70 provides for a rule to consider the full repeal of the flawed and ill-conceived Affordable Care Act.

The rule provides for 90 minutes of debate, divided and controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Further, the rule self-executes the Byrne amendment, which provides for a clean repeal of the entire Affordable Care Act. The rule further provides the minority with one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This approach—a full repeal—will give the House, particularly freshmen from both parties, an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the Affordable Care Act.

More than just a full repeal, the legislation before us provides for a process whereby the committees of jurisdiction are tasked with coming up with a replacement for the flawed law now being implemented. We know what ideas don't work. Those are the ideas enshrined into law in the Affordable Care Act. Now let's look toward ideas that will work.

□ 1230

I do look forward to working with the Energy and Commerce Committee's chairman, FRED UPTON, to craft meaningful legislation that will actually help the American people instead of strangle them with more government regulation, which is what the Affordable Care Act actually does.

Americans should have the freedom to make their own health care decisions. In March of 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was signed into law. It was drafted quickly and behind closed doors. It included secret deals, loopholes, drafting errors, and funding cliffs that allowed Federal agencies to be created without congressional knowledge or oversight.

More and more of the Affordable Care Act's supporters are having to admit to

the American people that, in their rush to pass a bill, the same people who put their voting cards in the slot and helped the ACA become law didn't actually know what was in the bill.

Now people are finding out what is in the bill, and they are upset. So upset are the American people that in every election for the House and Senate since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, more and more Republicans were chosen to replace supporters of the flawed law.

Indeed, this past fall, President Obama, in no uncertain terms, declared:

Make no mistake, my policies are on the ballot.

It is actually one of the few times I have ever agreed with this President. His policies were on the ballot, and the American people soundly rejected them, placing a historic majority of Republicans in the House and taking control of the Senate out of the hands of HARRY REID.

The bottom line: the drafting and passage of the Affordable Care Act was not the way to achieve meaningful reform. Many errors occurred through the language. This is why the Supreme Court this spring will be hearing a case that could upend the Affordable Care Act's subsidy structure. This case is entirely the fault of people who drafted and implemented the bill so poorly.

With the Supreme Court case looming, this body—this body—must be prepared to work for the American people and stave off the possible chaos which could ensue. The health care system in America needs reform and improvement, but the law that was passed will cost the American taxpayer millions of dollars, will not improve care, nor will it make it more affordable.

The bill that this House will vote on puts in place a procedure that will begin the process of crafting a replacement that could truly bring affordable access to health care to all Americans. The so-called Affordable Care Act does not accomplish that goal.

We need to start, and start fresh, and we need to address the issues with commonsense improvements that focus on the real issues at hand: creating a health care system that is focused on patients instead of payment, quality instead of quantity, affordability instead of cheapness, and innovation instead of stagnation. The first step is eliminating this bad legislation that simply does not work. That is why, today, I strongly support the repeal of the President's health care law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I rise in very strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying bill. Let me just say to my colleagues, to make it crystal clear, that this is an absolutely closed rule.

This bill had no hearings in any of the committees of jurisdiction; it was not reported out by any of the committees of jurisdiction; and the Committee on Rules decided last night that no Member, no Republican or Democrat, has the right to offer any amendments. This is a closed process.

Whatever happened to regular order?

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are again, back on the House floor with yet another pointless attempt by the Republican majority to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Today's exercise in time-wasting gamesmanship marks the 56th time that we have been down this well-traveled road.

Fifty-six. Let's see. That is two score and 16. It is 4½ dozen. But no matter how you add it up, it has to be some sort of world record in political futility.

So it is tempting to say that nothing has changed, but that is not exactly true because, in fact, a great deal has changed since my Republican colleagues first tried to repeal the ACA. Here are some of the things that changed:

The number of uninsured Americans has dropped by 10 million people; 3 million young adults have been able to gain coverage through a parent's plan; insurance companies can no longer discriminate on the basis of a so-called preexisting condition, like, say, being a woman; lifetime limits and caps on coverage have been eliminated; seniors have saved more than \$11 billion in prescription drugs, an average of \$1400 per Medicare beneficiary; copays and deductibles for preventive services for Medicare patients have been eliminated, and the solvency of the Medicare trust fund has been extended by 13 years; and the growth in health care spending in this country is the slowest on record, while health care price inflation is at its lowest rate in 50 years.

All that has happened thanks to the Affordable Care Act. If the Republicans get their way, much of it will disappear in an instant. If Republicans get their way, millions of Americans would lose their health care coverage, millions more would lose the subsidies they receive to purchase plans, millions of children would lose CHIP coverage, millions of seniors would lose benefits, and the deficit would increase.

So let's be crystal clear, Mr. Speaker: this is no longer a theoretical political exercise; this is very, very, very real. If this Republican bill were ever to become law, then real people would see real benefits taken away. That is why President Obama has said very plainly that he would veto this bill if it ever reached his desk.

There is something else new about this 56th version of Republicans banging their heads against a brick wall. For the first time, according to Politico:

House Republicans want to postpone the full repeal of ObamaCare for 6 months to allow time to come up with a replacement plan.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, when I read that, I actually laughed out loud. The health care crisis in this country has been happening for years and years—decades. How many studies have been done? How many reports issued? How many hearings and debates and news stories? But after all of that, my Republican friends still need another 6 months to come up with a replacement plan.

Here is an idea. Let's vote down this rule with the understanding that in 6 months—actually, I will give you 7, until after Labor Day—that in 7 months you will be back here with your magic replacement plan, which I assume will be flown in on a unicorn sliding down a rainbow.

I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because Republicans have absolutely no intention of actually doing the hard work of health care reform. This is just a gimmick. It is a chance for their new freshmen to cast their symbolic vote against ObamaCare so they can put out a press release and act like they have accomplished something.

As the Washington Examiner reported:

Republicans know that the repeal legislation isn't ever going to become law. "We are just getting it out of the way," one GOP aide told the Examiner when asked about the repeal vote.

Just getting it out of the way, Mr. Speaker? What a cynical abuse of this House. It is a sham. It is a waste of everyone's time. It deserves to be defeated in this House, and if it ever makes it out of the Senate, it deserves the quickest veto President Obama can muster.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. I may be new to this Chamber, but it sure seems like Groundhog Day around here to me. This is the 56th time my friends on the other side of the aisle have tried to repeal or weaken this landmark law, and the puzzle for me is that I know that they believe in so many of the provisions and support them.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, millions of people who didn't have insurance now have it and have signed up for the marketplace plans; 299,000 in Michigan alone.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle believe that nobody's health coverage should be dropped when they suddenly get diagnosed with cancer. I know my friends on the other side of the aisle don't want to tell 129 million Americans that they are going to be denied insurance because they have a preexisting condition. I know my friends don't want to kick young people off their parents' insurance plan, and I know they never want to go

back to the days of lifetime caps on health coverage or tell seniors they have got to start paying more for their medicine again. This is why I am totally perplexed, because if this bill were to pass, over 9.5 million Americans would be hurt and left behind without access to quality, affordable coverage.

The ACA may not be perfect. The last perfect law that there was agreement on was the Ten Commandments; and honestly, in today's climate, I am not sure we could get it through the Congress today. I urge my colleagues to work together with us on how to improve the law instead of constantly trying to do something they don't believe in.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise on the floor today really for two reasons, perhaps three. First of all, to support and defend the Committee on Rules last night where we overwhelmingly are in favor of making sure that every Member of this body has an opportunity to vote up or down on this terrible piece of legislation that is the law that is known as the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare.

This last election the people of this country openly asked the question in many districts across this country: Are you for or against this terrible law that was put through this Congress without one Republican vote? So it is only obvious that every single new Member of this body would want to have an opportunity to vote up or down.

Secondly, I want to defend the gentleman, Dr. BURGESS, a member of our committee, who was attacked last night. I unfortunately had taken 2 or 3 minutes away from the chair to attend to some other matters of the committee and was not available to be in the chair.

Thirdly, I want to stand up for my State of Texas. In defense of the State of Texas, there has been a lot of talk about Texas lately, not just last night, but lately. So I want to make sure that people have a better understanding to know why Texans are being attacked, and that is because we reject big, liberal government that is embodied in the laws that are known as ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act.

In defense of our great State of Texas, we represent people of the State of Texas, and I strongly stand with my fellow Texan and fellow committee member, the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS. Dr. BURGESS is not just a proud member of our delegation and a proud Member who represents Texas, just as I do, born in Waco, Texas, but I stand today for why Texas is a great State.

Evidently we have got to defend our honor. It was done last night in the

Committee on Rules; it is being done today on the floor of the House of Representatives. I stand in defense of Texas; although Texas I don't think really needs much defense.

Texans are proud people, and we have been a proud people since the days of the Alamo and San Jacinto. That is when we used to be our own nation. Texans are fiercely independent, and we, I think, lead to the very best not only for ourselves, but we are trying to do that also for America.

Texas is thriving, and the reason why we are thriving is because of economic growth, robust job creation, and overall quality of life. American families and businesses all across this country, I think, look to Texas as the leader in freedom and economic opportunity. That is what the Lone Star State is.

In our system of federalism, people can also vote with their feet. In the last 5 years, the Texas population grew by 1.8 million people. People from all over the United States, all 50 States, found a brighter future for themselves in Texas.

Over 1.6 million veterans call Texas home. These are men and women who fought for the freedoms that we enjoy and have today. Because of our communities, they support our veterans, and people know when they look to Texas, those people in Texas care about veterans and protecting our country.

□ 1245

Our churches, our schools, our hospitals, and our charities all lead the way in providing our citizens with things so that the government does not have to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, Dr. BURGESS was merely reflecting the views of our home State and the people who live there. Our Nation does better when we allow individuals to succeed, rather than look to government. We need to have a limited government, and people will then have more freedom.

While some people may think that limited government and empowering families is "crazy," I disagree. I think the numbers prove it. Texas has been called the great American job machine because we are the State that leads the Nation and the world. In fact, if Texas were its own country, it would have the 13th highest GDP in the world.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for the wonderful commercial for Texas. We all should visit Texas.

He said something that I thought was particularly interesting. He said: We're bringing this bill to the floor because every freshman deserves a vote on the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

I guess I would ask the chairman: Does he believe that every freshman also deserves a vote on increasing the

minimum wage or on comprehensive immigration reform or on adequate child care for our children in this country or on a whole number of other issues which we have routinely been denied the right to even have a vote on these issues on the House floor, which is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world?

What he neglects to tell everybody, including these freshmen—some of whom are Republicans—is that under this rule, you can't amend anything. You have been totally locked out.

The committees of jurisdiction didn't hold a hearing. The committees of jurisdiction didn't hold a markup. Nothing was reported out of any of these committees, notwithstanding the fact that they have been constituted and organized—nothing.

It just shows up in the Rules Committee, and they bring it to the floor under a completely closed process. This is a lousy way to run a Congress.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

Here we go again. This bill marks yet another attempt by the Republican majority to repeal the Affordable Care Act but the first time after implementation of many of the provisions that Americans have relied upon.

People think the ACA only provides the ability to buy health insurance on an exchange or marketplace. Yes, it is a new way to shop for health insurance in which you can compare plans apples to apples. Yes, it is a way to obtain subsidies to make that coverage more affordable. Yes, with all these benefits, people can join the system and cover themselves prior to a medical catastrophe.

However, the Affordable Care Act has also accomplished so much more than that. Repealing the law lock, stock, and barrel that has been in place for nearly 5 years is not in anyone's best interest.

As an example, the ACA created the prevention and public health fund, an unprecedented mandatory investment in States' public health systems. The need for this investment has become increasingly evident after public health emergencies in recent months—evidenced by Ebola and, today, measles.

Repealing the ACA today would mean 129 million Americans could again be denied insurance coverage for preexisting conditions. It would mean Americans would no longer have access to free preventive services such as vaccines, disease screenings, well-child visits, and tobacco cessation.

I heard from one of my constituents Lara who, as a freelance film producer with a former cancer diagnosis, found getting health insurance to be impossible. Thanks to the ACA, she now has

coverage and is able to have regular checkups to make sure that the cancer does not return.

Do you want to take away all of that? The health care providers, health plans, and consumer advocates in my district and across the country have worked hard to put these provisions in place and to make the ACA work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MATSUI. We can't take this away now. It works.

I urge my colleagues to vote down the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you, Dr. BURGESS. You are doing an outstanding job with this course and health care in general. I appreciate it so very much. I know my constituents do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill to repeal and replace the President's health care law.

Health care reform should lower costs and increase access; instead, the President's signature piece of legislation didn't let people keep the plans they liked, raised health care premiums, and cut Medicare by \$500 billion.

When the President said, "If you like your plan, you can keep it," my constituents told me that wasn't true. On average, a 30-year-old woman in Pasco County, Florida, will see her prices increase over 30 percent. Costs haven't been lowered. It is as simple as that.

The Obama administration willingly cut Medicare to pay for a health care law that was poorly written and implemented.

Support H.R. 596, and repeal this law, and support a patient-centered, free market alternative that will lower costs and increase access to care.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. There is no replacement here. All the Republicans want to do is repeal the Affordable Care Act and take away all these important benefits that people have received as a result of it.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN, for giving me a chance to tell a little personal story about the success of the Affordable Care Act and its impact on the Perlmutter family.

On election day, my wife, a teacher in the Jeffco school system in Colorado, who had hardly ever been to the hospital, had something that they thought was pretty devastating. She went into surgery on election day.

It turned out it was exploratory. A very rare condition was exposed which required a second surgery. Only a handful of surgeons across this country deal

with that kind of condition. The surgeons who do it were outside of the network of the original insurance company that provided insurance for her.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, we were able to go into the exchange and find an insurance company through an outstanding insurance broker. Rocky Mountain Health Plans had a surgeon who could handle this kind of condition and was within their network.

It provided her with fantastic medical care and peace of mind that she was going to somebody who knew precisely what they were doing, and it was all because of the Affordable Care Act.

Under the Affordable Care Act, you cannot discriminate against people with a preexisting condition; so for her, she was able to have the peace of mind that is required for recovery. She got the best medical care possible through a coverage that was professional and prompt in its service.

Physically, mentally, and emotionally, the Affordable Care Act helped her find a physician equipped and qualified to help her condition.

The Affordable Care Act is a civil rights act, and it has got to be upheld.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, today, we will take our 56th vote to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act.

In my home State of Kentucky—a nationwide success story of this law—521,000 Kentuckians enrolled in health coverage last year. That is more than a half a million people in a State with a population of just over 4 million. Seventy-five percent of those who signed up were previously uninsured.

These are maps of before and after uninsured rates in our 120 counties. The orange and red represent uninsured rates of 14 percent to more than 20 percent. The dark blue is less than 5 percent.

Today, after the Affordable Care Act, every single county has had a reduction in their uninsured rates. In some areas, uninsured rates have plummeted by more than 65 percent.

As we watch these uninsured rates drop, as the counties on this map go from red to green or blue, that is another person getting the care or treatment they need, a family's future transformed, lives saved.

This law is a success. The Affordable Care Act is working, and you need to look no further than the Commonwealth of Kentucky to see the proof.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act at this stage would be an absolute death sentence to thousands of people in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and throughout the country. We cannot let this happen.

I urge a vote against the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he has any more speakers?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I was just curious because it seems like there is no enthusiasm on your side for debating this for the 56th time.

Mr. BURGESS. I generally reserve my enthusiasm for closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule for consideration of legislation that would encourage schools to provide career education about local manufacturing jobs.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, instead of wasting time on bills that would strip health care away from millions of Americans, we should be focusing on legislation like my bill, the American Manufacturing Jobs for Students Act, which will help connect young people to highly skilled manufacturing jobs in their own communities. A strong middle class begins with early and effective career education.

Small business owners in my district have told me time and time again that they cannot find the workforce they need in the communities where they are located. Many high school graduates are underemployed and have trouble finding innovative and inspiring careers close to home.

My bill would bridge that gap by fostering connections between manufacturing jobs, small businesses, and schools. It will support student engagement and professional relationships with local businesses through workplace visits and hands-on learning experiences. It will strengthen the economy and help employers find the employees they need close to home.

By giving middle and high school students the opportunity to learn firsthand about exciting and innovative careers in manufacturing, we can strengthen our country's economic competitiveness. We can also encourage manufacturers to keep their production in the United States.

We should do all we can to ensure that job creators stay here to provide opportunities for our own constituents. We should be working together on bills like the American Manufacturing Jobs for Students Act and not on bills which are dead on arrival when they reach the President's desk.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, Dr. DAN BENISHEK.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill.

I have been a doctor in northern Michigan for 30 years, and I have always put the needs of my patients first. I believe it is time for Congress to do the same thing today.

We need to get to work on finding bipartisan and commonsense solutions that will put the patient and their doctor back in control of health care decisions and help lower the cost of health care while maintaining the quality.

□ 1300

We need to focus on things like allowing people to purchase health insurance across State lines, just like we can already do with car insurance, making health insurance portable so you can take it with you from job to job, another simple change that would improve access to health care. A few of these simple changes would dramatically improve the quality of care available while lowering the overall cost.

Many of the patients that I have been talking to tell me their health insurance has gone up, their deductible has gone up. This is not bringing more health care to the American people. This is bringing less health care to the American people. They have less access to care now than they have had in the past.

I hope all my colleagues today will join me in voting "yes" on H.R. 596 so that we can finally pass patient-centered improvements to our Nation's health care system.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled by what I just heard from the gentleman about all these alternatives to fix and improve our health care system.

Four years ago, the Republicans passed an identical bill like the one we are considering today in which they said they ordered their committees to report out alternative replacement language or their vision of what a health care reform should be. That was 4 years ago.

They have done nothing but demagogue this issue for 4 years, and here we are again today, playing political gamesmanship with a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act and take away health insurance for millions of Americans, increase prescription drug prices for our senior citizens, raise taxes on middle class families, and they have nothing to replace it with. This is a waste of our time. This is an insult to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue, as important as the health of the American people.

I salute Congresswoman BROWNLEY for her alternative bill that we should be voting on, if we can defeat this rule, that helps students get manufacturing jobs, just what we have been asking

for, a collaboration between business and education where kids are trained for good-paying jobs as they leave school.

Instead, the Republicans are putting forth this rule that would, once again, for the 56th time, repeal the Affordable Care Act.

We come together on the floor of the House right now, when we need to pass a homeland security bill to protect the American people. The Speaker said in December, when we didn't pass the appropriation bill for the year, we will do it after the first of the year.

In January, the world was alarmed by what they saw in Paris. The whole world was galvanized around the issue of fighting terrorism and protecting homeland security, except in this hermetically sealed House Chamber.

We still haven't done what we take an oath to do: support and protect the American people when we take an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Instead, we have the Republicans continuing to bay at the Moon. They are baying at the Moon, something that is not going to work; and instead of proposing any, which we would be welcome to hear, good suggestions they may have to approve the Affordable Care Act, they are baying at the Moon—56 times.

We have important work to do for the American people. They want us here to create jobs. They want us here to protect them. We need to pass that homeland security bill. Instead, in our hermetically sealed world, oblivious to what is going on outside, we are taking this up.

They want to strip health security from America's families. They are willing to threaten what that means to our economy, willing to jeopardize the need for us to lower costs for businesses is what this bill does.

I have said over and over again, even if everyone loves his or her health insurance or his or her health care, even if that were the case in our country, we would still have had to pass the Affordable Care Act because the cost to individuals, to families, to businesses large and small, to governments—local, State, and national—the cost was unsustainable. That was one of the things the Affordable Care Act set out to do, and I am so pleased to show that the statistics show that the rate of growth of health costs is going at a lower rate than ever in our history—very important.

The CBO projected that this bill would save—what?—hundreds of billions of dollars, maybe up to \$1 trillion over its projected life, the life that we have to account for when we put it before us.

So this is about the health of our people. It is about the health of our economy. It is about lowering costs.

It is important to know what is at stake, because families are seeing the full promise of the Affordable Care Act emerge, to make health care a right for all, not a privilege for the few:

8.2 million seniors have saved more than \$11.5 billion on their prescription drugs since this bill passed, an average of \$1,407 per senior;

105 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit or an annual limit on their coverage. This is what you want to repeal today;

129 million Americans with pre-existing conditions no longer have to worry about being denied coverage because of their health status. That is what you want to repeal today.

It is also important to note that, with the success of the Affordable Care Act and the 9.5 million people who are signed up in marketplaces, including Medicaid expansion, 19 million uninsured Americans will be covered in 2015.

In addition to that, the Affordable Care Act has pushed forth the solvency of Medicare for 13 years longer. That is what you want to repeal today.

Our Founders, how beautiful they were in all that they did and wrote and their courage and their optimism for the future. They wrote about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the Declaration of Independence. In that Declaration of Independence, that is the independence we want to give people: for a healthier life, the liberty to pursue their happiness without being job-locked because of a health care policy, free to be self-employed, to start a business, to change jobs, to pursue their happiness.

So this is about, again, the health of our country, not just the health care of our country. On our path forward today, and in the future, the Affordable Care Act will continue to rank up there with Social Security, with Medicare, a third pillar of economic and health security for the American people.

So I urge our colleagues to vote "no" on this rule. Enable Congresswoman BROWNLEY's education proposal to match kids up with skills and jobs, something that this country needs to move on to legislation to create good-paying jobs, to add bigger paychecks for America's working families, to stop the stagnation of wages, and to do so in a way that understands how important health care is to reducing the deficit in addition to improving the health of our country.

Again, by the way, the clock is ticking on the bill for homeland security. That is our responsibility: to support and protect. Let's get about the business that we take an oath to do instead of, for the 56th time, bay at the Moon. It is hard to understand why we would waste the time of this Chamber and the American people on this frivolous resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of response.

First off, I don't know. Maybe people weren't paying attention, but the House has passed a funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security. It awaits action over in the Senate. So if the minority leader is concerned, perhaps she can talk to people in the other

body about whether or not it might be a good idea for them to take some action, and that would be the correct way to proceed. The House acts; the Senate acts. I refer people who are unclear on that concept to "Schoolhouse Rock," and it will tell you how a bill becomes law.

People talk about the 56th time we have had something on the floor. Obviously, I don't know that I can attest to the accuracy of that count, but what I can attest to the accuracy of is that 11 times the President of the United States has signed into law some action passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and then subsequently signed by the President—11 times—modifying or changing his signature legislation, the Affordable Care Act. Probably what is more telling is the 28 times—28 times—that the President has simply set aside part of his law because it wasn't convenient.

If the other side wants, I can go through and delineate these one by one. I have, actually, a document prepared by the Galen Institute, and I would refer people to them if they would like to look at this.

But really, some of the things that the President himself has set aside—I mean, who can forget, in a blog post, the administration setting aside the employer mandate, the entire employer mandate. Not surprising, because when the President was a candidate and he came down to Texas and debated Hillary Clinton for the nomination in 2008, he was against the mandate, and then he was for it. So then he set it aside right before the Fourth of July in 2013. And for people who aren't paying attention, guess what? It actually started January 1 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if only we were debating another subsidy for Big Oil or another tax break for some special corporate interest, my colleagues would be down here with great joy advocating for it.

But when it comes to a bill to ensure that millions and millions of our citizens get health insurance, they want to repeal it. When it comes to protecting our senior citizens who are seeing their prescription drugs being lowered because of this bill, they want to repeal it. When it comes to eliminating pre-existing conditions, they want to repeal it. I mean, that tells you all you need to know about where their priorities are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the Republican majority.

As a new Member, I haven't had the opportunity to speak on this issue on the House floor or vote on it. When I saw that the previous Congress had voted 55 times to repeal the Affordable

Care Act, I was a little concerned that I would miss all the fun. So I am very happy that we now have a 56th vote on this issue, and it gives me an opportunity to say what a strong supporter I am of the Affordable Care Act.

This has worked. More than 10 million Americans have health insurance today that otherwise would not have it. More than 3 million children have been able to stay on their parents' plan who otherwise would not have had health insurance. And another 3 million, on top of that, have extra protections through State-affiliated agencies, such as CHIP, that would not have it today if not for the Affordable Care Act.

Now, with the rate of the uninsured at its lowest percentage in American history, you would think that with this success that maybe the downside would be that health care costs would have gone through the roof. In fact, quite the opposite has happened. We have just had a year in which health care costs rose by the lowest rate in 50 years—and this is something that all Americans can celebrate, Democrats and Republicans.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the 56th time, this Congress will attempt to repeal the entire Affordable Care Act. It is a mistake. I will join my colleagues in voting against it.

I would say sincerely to Members on the other side, if there are those who are willing to look openly at this issue and say, yes, it has largely worked but let's address those areas that could do better, I think you will find those, particularly new Members on this side of the aisle, who are open-minded toward that and want to address areas that can be improved. Look at all the times that Medicare has been improved since its initial passage in 1965.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

□ 1315

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and for leading around this Nation on this issue. So far away from Texas as even Iowa, the gentleman from Texas has fought for the full 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare and laid out, I think, a good strategy for the future health care circumstances in America.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would say that, when this passed, many of us went through a long battle here on the floor of the House of Representatives and outside among the masses of people that came here and surrounded the United States Capitol to plead: Do not take our liberty. Let us manage our own health and our own health care, and let us purchase a health insurance policy that is right for us, not one that the government thinks is right for us, and let's do something that is constitutional.

Well, we watched as that drama unfolded and engaged in that drama. I have a number of scars left over from

that. In the end, ObamaCare passed by hook, by crook, and by legislative she-nanigan. History shows that. The litigation that has emerged and the litigation yet to emerge will shape this to some degree, but this Congress needs to resolve this.

What had happened was, in the election in 2010, 87 freshmen Republicans were elected into office here to come, and every single one of them ran on the full 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare. That was a transformative election. It shifted the majority from the Democrats to the Republicans, Mr. Speaker, a mandate to repeal ObamaCare. We acted on that mandate.

In fact, the morning after ObamaCare was passed, I was at the door—my staff was actually at the door. I had written a bill in the middle of the night to repeal ObamaCare. I had the first draft to repeal ObamaCare, a component of 40 words, and it applies to two sections of the bill. That bill was drafted March 24, 2010. It was filed March 25, 2010. I filed a discharge petition down here on the floor on the 16th of June 2010—it received 173 signatures—with Republicans in the minority, Mr. Speaker. It has been a long effort.

We voted on the full repeal of ObamaCare, H.R. 2 by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Cantor), on the 19th of January 2011; another repeal by Mr. Cantor on the 9th of July 2012, always with the 40-word King language in it; and again on the 16th of May 2013, H.R. 45.

We have been bringing the full repeal of ObamaCare here to the floor over and over again to give everybody an opportunity—even those who didn't have an opportunity to get involved in this debate—to go on record and tell us where you want to see the future of the health care circumstances here in the United States. Every Republican up to this point has voted to repeal ObamaCare.

Every Member of the House, with the exception of those that were sworn in for the first time this Congress, has had that chance. Now we give everyone that chance, and we will send a full repeal over to the Senate so the nine freshmen Republicans over there can clearly also go on record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Because we want to elect a President who will take the oath on January 20, 2017, to sign the repeal of ObamaCare at the podium on the west portico of the Capitol as the very first act of the next President of the United States.

So I thank the leadership for incorporating my language into this bill. I thank those all across this country who have stepped up to defend our constitutional liberties, our personal liberties. When this is done, we will get to work on putting together a good health insurance and health care delivery system in America in spite of all of the

time that we have lost fighting over this unconstitutional mess called ObamaCare.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just would remind the gentleman from Iowa that there was a Republican Presidential candidate named Mitt Romney who ran on the platform of total repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and he lost. And, by the way, Obama won Iowa by 51–46.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Groundhog Day. How appropriate that the Republican majority chose today for their 56th attempt to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act. These futile, ideological gestures are getting old.

The vote I cast for the health care law is one of the proudest I have cast in my political career because the reforms that we put in place are helping millions of families across the Nation. Americans can no longer be denied coverage for a preexisting condition. Preventive screenings, maternity care, and pediatric care are now all covered. Seniors enjoy relief from high drug costs. Millions of low-income children have health care through the CHIP program. Women's health has been put on an equal footing. Insurers can no longer subject families to lifetime caps on coverage. Annual caps are being phased out.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Affordable Care Act has reduced the number of uninsured people by 12 million last year, 19 million this year. My Republican colleagues don't really care about that because they have health care as a Member of Congress. Why should they worry about people who do not have health care?

The CBO has also cut its estimate of the cost of rolling out coverage to millions of Americans, a saving of \$140 billion compared to previous estimates. This is good news. It should be on the front page of every newspaper.

The Affordable Care Act has succeeded by putting people—not insurance companies—in charge of health care. It has given millions of families care that they can depend on. We are a better country because of it.

Let me say to my colleagues in the majority: Give it a rest. Get a life. The American people like this law. The Supreme Court has upheld it. We have had two elections around it. Stop trying to take away people's health care benefits.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for being astute in reminding us of the vast bipartisan support for the important Affordable Care Act. If I might add, the past Presidential candidate who lost was the same Gov-

ernor, however, I understand, that supported it and succeeded in his support of it at that time.

But I think what is important is to again remind this Nation that we are now on the 56th annual trip to repeal what has been a lifesaver to Americans across the country. Let me simply share these very potent points:

People not having health insurance include 20 percent of the underinsured who delay receiving care when signs of illness appear; 15 percent of the underinsured had problems paying medical bills; 10 percent of the underinsured needed prescription drugs but could not afford them; 8 percent were hounded by collection agencies, many of them went into bankruptcy because of health issues—of course we have tried to reform that—6 percent did not seek treatment even though they needed it; and, of course, a report by the Congressional Budget Office, The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 states that the actual cost of the Affordable Care Act is 7 percent lower than first calculated in 2010.

Let me tell you the real issues, the story of a lady written up in The Ledger, dated January 8, 2015, who was diagnosed with leukemia in 2013. She determined that her insurance at that time would not allow her to have health insurance. Her words are: "I thought I was going to die," Ms. Gray said. In her scramble to try to get drugs, she was left holding the bag, yet she was able to get the Affordable Care Act starting on January 1, 2014. It gave her access to the recommended chemotherapy. Her cancer went into remission in the fall, and she is alive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. What about the situation of the measles? Why do we have this dead-end road again, repetitiously voting against the valuable Affordable Care Act that has saved lives?

Does anybody know about Medicare? It goes on and on and on. And many on the other side of the aisle opposed it in 1965.

I am going to stand on the right side of history and support the Affordable Care Act. Vote against this untimely bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of a response.

First off, when Medicare passed, it was passed with a bipartisan vote in the House of Representatives, and that is a matter of historic record. In fact, that is one of the weaknesses of the President's takeover of health care in this country is that it passed only with Democratic votes in both the House and the Senate on final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I also went through the number of times that the President has unilaterally delayed, deferred, or simply dismissed parts of his own law. One of, perhaps, the most troublesome, one of the most curious, is when the Presi-

dent set aside entry into his own preexisting pool in January of 2013, they did that because they were worried that they were going to run out of money in the preexisting fund. But the reality was that for anyone who was hoping to get coverage under the preexisting pool beginning in January–February of 2013, they were told: Sorry. Window closed. Go somewhere else.

Then to add further insult to injury, when they couldn't get the Web site up and working at the end of 2013, they actually had to extend coverage in the Federal preexisting pool until March of 2014 so those patients would not be left out in the cold.

So the President has been deeply involved in delaying parts and deferring parts and repealing parts of his very own law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I intend to offer in the RECORD along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question. This would be the amendment that Ms. BROWNLEY of California talked about, providing manufacturing training for our high school students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me begin by talking about the process. Let me say two words about this process: it stinks.

We have a bill before us today on the House floor that bypassed all of the committees of jurisdiction. And I say to my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, if you are on the Energy and Commerce Committee, on the Education and the Workforce Committee, or on the Ways and Means Committee, you should be outraged that legislation that is under your jurisdiction never went to your committees. It just showed up in the Rules Committee last night. And on top of all of that, no amendments are allowed; nobody can offer any ideas.

I have heard some of my Republican colleagues talk about they have ideas for making the Affordable Care Act better or for replacing it. They don't have the opportunity even to bring those ideas to this House floor.

Four years ago, we voted on a similar measure which said that the Republicans would have the committees of jurisdiction report out alternatives. It is 4 years later, and we are doing the same thing over and over and over again. It is a waste of taxpayer time. It is an insult to the American people.

And as far as the substance of what my Republican friends are trying to do, I just wonder if any of my friends on the other side of the aisle would have the courage to say to people face to face, "I am going to take your health care away," because that is what this

bill would do. That is what this bill would do, and it is shameful.

When I first ran for office, I said to my constituents that one of the things I was committed to was to making sure that everybody in this country had health insurance. Health care ought to be a right. Nobody should have to worry whether or not they can afford to get the health care that, quite frankly, every American is entitled to and deserves. We have made a great stride forward with the Affordable Care Act.

Is it perfect? No.

Could it be better? Yes.

But to come up with bill after bill after bill, 56 times of repeal, repeal, it is getting old. It is getting boring. People are sick of this.

Let me just remind my colleagues about what this bill has accomplished, just because this is no longer a rhetorical, abstract debate. These are some real things that have changed.

The number of insured Americans has dropped by about 10 million people. I mean, that is a good thing. I am sorry my colleagues have a problem with that. But I think most Americans, Democrats and Republicans, think that is a good thing.

Three million young adults have been able to gain coverage through a parent's plan. I think that is good.

Insurance companies can no longer discriminate on the basis of a so-called preexisting condition, like, say, being a woman. I think that is a great thing. I am sorry my colleagues have a problem with that.

Lifetime limits and caps on coverage have been eliminated. That is wonderful.

Seniors have saved more than \$11 billion in prescription drugs, an average of \$1,400 per Medicare beneficiary. That is positive. We knew that there was a flaw, the doughnut hole, in the Medicare prescription drug bill. This fixed it.

Copays and deductibles for preventive services for Medicare patients have been eliminated, and the solvency of the Medicare trust fund has been extended by 13 years. That is a good thing. Now, I know my friends on the other side of the aisle want to privatize Medicare or have no use for Medicare, but for those of us who want to see this program move well into the next century in complete solvency, this is a good thing.

□ 1330

The growth in health care spending in this country is the slowest on record while health care price inflation is at its lowest rate in 50 years. This didn't happen by accident. This happened because we passed the Affordable Care Act, and if Republicans get their way, all of these things will disappear.

This is a debate, I think, about values more than anything else. This is about whether or not we believe that everybody in this country ought to have health insurance, whether or not

we ought to make the reforms that I have just mentioned part of the permanent culture of this country.

I think this is good. I voted for the Affordable Care Act. I am proud I voted for the Affordable Care Act. My friends, this issue about health care and access to health care has been around for decades and decades and decades, and my friends have done nothing.

Their prescription for health care reform has been: take two tax breaks, and call me in the morning. That is the total reform that they have advocated in the time I have been here and in the time I have been paying attention to what has been going on in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to appreciate that this Congress did something positive in passing the Affordable Care Act, and we ought not to let extremists on the other side take the protections away from the American people.

We are going to fight you every step of the way because we believe that people in this country are entitled to health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me first address the question of process because the Affordable Care Act did pass in the 111th Congress. The Affordable Care Act, as it came to the 111th Congress under then-Speaker PELOSI, was not a bill that had been considered in any of the committees of jurisdiction. H.R. 3590 came to us from the Senate of the United States.

Now, in fairness, H.R. 3590 had passed the floor of the House, I believe it was July of 2009; but H.R. 3590, when it passed the floor of the House, was a bill dealing with veterans housing.

So it goes over to the Senate to await further work, and to be sure, in the meantime, H.R. 3200 and then a couple of follow-on bills were marked up in committees, and then the Speaker condensed things and introduced her own bill.

We heard it on the floor of the House; and, indeed, it passed in November of 2009. Mr. Speaker, that was the end of the line for that bill. No one has seen or heard from it again.

My friends on the other side may remember some parts of that bill. What about the Independent Payment Advisory Board? Was that included in the House-passed bill? No, it was not.

Well, there was a public option because the Democrats felt very strongly about having a public option. Really, they wanted a single-payer system, so a way to move to a single-payer system was to include the public option, but the public option wasn't in H.R. 3590.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3590, a House-passed bill dealing with veterans hous-

ing, went over to the Senate where, sometime between Thanksgiving and Christmas, it was pulled out of HARRY REID's desk and amended.

The amendment read "strike all after the enacting clause and insert." All of the housing language was removed, and all of the health care language was inserted. This travesty was passed on Christmas Eve in 2009.

A big snowstorm was bearing down on Washington, D.C., Senators wanted to get home to be with their families before the airport closed, and so it was passed in the early hours of Christmas Eve in 2009.

Now, shortly after that, Massachusetts had a special election to fill the vacancy that occurred after the unfortunate death of Senator Kennedy. That vacancy was filled for the first time by a Republican from Massachusetts.

I think that was really the first time since the Earth cooled, the first time that a Republican had been elected from Massachusetts. The critical point on that was that HARRY REID no longer had 60 votes over in the Senate.

Prior to that, he had been pretty much impervious: I have got 60 votes. I am going to do what I want. Democrats can bust a filibuster on anything because they have got 60 votes.

After the loss of that 60th vote, H.R. 3590 could not be changed—or at least HARRY REID's assertion was that it could not be changed, and Speaker PELOSI would simply have to pass what he gave her.

Now, there was a lot of resistance here on the House to passing—even on the Democratic side—there was a lot of resistance to passing that bill that came over from the Senate because it was not a House product.

It had the Independent Payment Advisory Board in it. It didn't have a public option in it. Many of the Democratic Members were reluctant to engage on this. In fact, I think the quote from Speaker PELOSI that day was: I don't have 100 votes for this thing over on the House side.

Over the ensuing 3 months, they did convince and cajole enough of their Members to pass this by the slimmest of majorities in the early part of March of 2010, and that leads us to where we are today.

Mr. Speaker, it was the 111th Congress that passed this thing. I had 18 amendments to the Affordable Care Act that I dutifully took up to the Rules Committee when we were in the minority and said: Look, I don't like what you are doing, but let's at least keep it from being quite the problem that it is going to be.

Every one of those was rejected. I lost on a 9-4 vote. No surprise—it is the Speaker's committee, she held the votes on the committee, but don't tell me that this was a process of anything other than what was a very flawed and partisan process.

Now, several people today have referenced the Founders and the Declaration of Independence. The reality is,

Mr. Speaker, we are a country that was founded on the principle of government with the consent of the governed.

No one was asking for this thing. No one wanted this thing. Sure, 14 percent of people in this country have been helped, so they like it. Seventeen percent have been hurt, such as myself. I lost my health savings account under the Affordable Care Act. Seventeen percent of the country doesn't like it.

Most everyone else feels as if, "I am basically unaffected, I may have a problem ideologically either pro or con, but I have not been affected."

Mr. Speaker, I do recommend that people pay attention. The employer mandate actually became effective January 1 of this year. It won't really affect people until next year when medium-sized businesses begin to file their taxes and find that if they have not kept up with all of the laborious reporting requirements and paperwork requirements under the employer mandate, they are going to be in a world of hurt when they file their taxes for calendar year 2015.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a piece of legislation that the American people have time and again said they do not want.

I thank Mr. BYRNE for his legislation and for working on this matter. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 70 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 645) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide career education pathways in manufacturing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 645.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 70, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 176, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—242

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Frelinghuysen | McHenry |
| Aderholt | Garrett | McKinley |
| Allen | Gibbs | McMorris |
| Amash | Gibson | Rodgers |
| Amodei | Gohmert | McSally |
| Babin | Goodlatte | Meadows |
| Barletta | Gosar | Meehan |
| Barr | Gowdy | Messer |
| Barton | Granger | Mica |
| Benishek | Graves (GA) | Miller (FL) |
| Bilirakis | Graves (LA) | Miller (MI) |
| Bishop (MI) | Graves (MO) | Moolenaar |
| Bishop (UT) | Griffith | Mooney (WV) |
| Black | Grothman | Mullin |
| Blackburn | Guinta | Mulvaney |
| Blum | Guthrie | Murphy (PA) |
| Bost | Hanna | Neugebauer |
| Boustany | Hardy | Newhouse |
| Brady (TX) | Harper | Noem |
| Brat | Harris | Nugent |
| Bridenstine | Hartzler | Nunes |
| Brooks (AL) | Heck (NV) | Olson |
| Brooks (IN) | Hensarling | Palazzo |
| Buchanan | Herrera Beutler | Palmer |
| Buck | Hice (GA) | Paulsen |
| Bucshon | Hill | Pearce |
| Burgess | Holding | Perry |
| Byrne | Hudson | Pittenger |
| Calvert | Huelskamp | Pitts |
| Carter (GA) | Huizenga (MI) | Poe (TX) |
| Carter (TX) | Hultgren | Poliquin |
| Chabot | Hunter | Pompeo |
| Chaffetz | Hurd (TX) | Posey |
| Clawson (FL) | Hurt (VA) | Price (GA) |
| Coffman | Issa | Ratcliffe |
| Cole | Jenkins (KS) | Reed |
| Collins (GA) | Jenkins (WV) | Reichert |
| Collins (NY) | Johnson (OH) | Renacci |
| Comstock | Johnson, Sam | Ribble |
| Conaway | Jolly | Rice (SC) |
| Cook | Jones | Rigell |
| Costello (PA) | Jordan | Roby |
| Cramer | Joyce | Rogers (AL) |
| Crawford | Katko | Rogers (KY) |
| Crenshaw | Kelly (PA) | Rohrabacher |
| Culberson | King (IA) | Rokita |
| Curbelo (FL) | King (NY) | Rooney (FL) |
| Davis, Rodney | Kinzinger (IL) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Denham | Klaine | Roskam |
| Dent | Knight | Ross |
| DeSantis | Labrador | Rothfus |
| DesJarlais | LaMalfa | Rouzer |
| Diaz-Balart | Lamborn | Royce |
| Dold | Lance | Russell |
| Duffy | Latta | Ryan (WI) |
| Duncan (SC) | LoBiondo | Salmon |
| Duncan (TN) | Long | Sanford |
| Ellmers | Loudermilk | Scalise |
| Emmer | Love | Schock |
| Farenthold | Lucas | Schweikert |
| Fincher | Luetkemeyer | Scott, Austin |
| Fitzpatrick | Lummis | Sensenbrenner |
| Fleischmann | MacArthur | Sessions |
| Fleming | Marchant | Shimkus |
| Flores | Marino | Shuster |
| Forbes | Massie | Simpson |
| Fortenberry | McCarthy | Smith (MO) |
| Fox | McCaul | Smith (NE) |
| Franks (AZ) | McClintock | Smith (NJ) |

Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton

Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—176

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clark (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

NOT VOTING—15

Cárdenas
Chu (CA)
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Gutiérrez

Langevin
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Rush
Smith (WA)
Tsongas
Wilson (FL)
Young (AK)

□ 1405

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, CUELLAR, Ms. HAHN, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 178, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Marino
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribbie
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho

Young (IA)
Young (IN)

Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—178

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Castro (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Lee

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Chu (CA)
Duckworth
Gutiérrez
Langevin
Lee

Lofgren
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Rush
Smith (WA)

□ 1413

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 267, nays 148, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—267

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego

Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney
Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem

Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palmer
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ribble
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scaless
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Trott
Upton
Van Hollen
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—148

Adams
Aguilar
Amash

Bass
Benishek
Bera

Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle (PA)

Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dingell
Dold
Duffy
Elmiers
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxy
Fudge
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Honda

Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Larson (CT)
Lewis
LoBlundo
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McSally
Meehan
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters

Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schock
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Slaughter
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—17

Chaffetz
Chu (CA)
Duckworth
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez

Langevin
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Rangel
Roe (TN)

Rush
Smith (WA)
Tsongas
Wilson (FL)
Young (AK)

□ 1420

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: Roll Call #54—Yea; Roll Call #55—Yea; Roll Call #56—Yea.

REPEAL OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 70, I call up the bill (H.R. 596) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 70, the amendment printed in House Report 114-13 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF PPACA AND HEALTH CARE-RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.

(a) PPACA.—Effective on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such Act are restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted.

(b) HEALTH CARE-RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.—Effective on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such title or subtitle, respectively, are restored or revived as if such title and subtitle had not been enacted.

SEC. 2. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

SEC. 3. REPORTING REPLACEMENT LEGISLATION.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall each report to the House of Representatives legislation proposing changes to existing law within each committee's jurisdiction with provisions that—

(1) foster economic growth and private sector job creation by eliminating job-killing policies and regulations;

(2) lower health care premiums through increased competition and choice;

(3) preserve a patient's ability to keep his or her health plan if he or she likes it;

(4) provide people with pre-existing conditions access to affordable health coverage;

(5) reform the medical liability system to reduce unnecessary and wasteful health care spending;

(6) increase the number of insured Americans;

(7) protect the doctor-patient relationship;

(8) provide the States greater flexibility to administer Medicaid programs while reducing costs under such programs;

(9) expand incentives to encourage personal responsibility for health care coverage and costs;

(10) prohibit taxpayer funding of abortions and provide conscience protections for health care providers;

(11) eliminate duplicative government programs and wasteful spending; or

(12) do not accelerate the growth of entitlement programs or increase the tax burden on Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 90 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 596.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 596, sponsored by BRADLEY BYRNE of Alabama.

Today, the House acts, once again, to repeal ObamaCare. Millions of Americans continue to feel the harmful effects of the President's health care law in almost every corner of their lives.

Recently, I heard from a public schoolteacher who told me that many of our local schools are having trouble finding long-term substitutes for specialty classes such as art, music, and physical education. Under ObamaCare's new definition of full-time work, substitute teachers are strictly limited to 3½ days a week. Children are simply missing out on these important classes or are being pushed into packed, combined classes. Many of our local schools have already had to outsource cafeteria workers and other part-time positions. School districts are spending too much time worrying about Federal mandates rather than the best way to teach children.

Republicans have no shortage of good ideas with which to replace the President's health care law. Last session, there were hundreds of bills introduced to reform health care with more affordable choices. We will hear many of these good ideas and other reasons for repeal today, and I look forward to hearing from my colleagues. The American people continue to oppose the President's health care law, and, today, House Republicans will stand with them again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have great respect for my colleague from Pennsylvania, but I just think more and more what I am hearing from my Republican colleagues is what I call "fantasy land." This isn't the America we know.

In the past few years, since the Affordable Care Act has taken effect, so many Americans who didn't have health insurance now have it. Something like 19 million Americans who were uninsured now have health insurance. Millions of young adults have health insurance because they are able to stay on their parents' plans. There are 129 million Americans who can no longer be denied health insurance for having preexisting conditions. Seniors

have saved so much money on the prescription drugs. I could go on and on, but I don't need to.

Americans like the Affordable Care Act. It is working. We cannot go back. We cannot turn over the health care system again to the insurance companies, which are going to have skeletal plans, not provide good benefits, raise premiums to whatever they want, and not actually have any help from the Federal Government. When you repeal ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, you are basically giving Americans a tax increase because they are not going to be able to get the tax credits or the subsidies that help them pay for their premiums and make those premiums affordable. This is working. This is happening. This isn't something we can just throw away.

The Republicans say—what did my colleagues say?—that the GOP has no shortage of good ideas. What ideas? Four years ago, when they first took the majority in this House, the House Republicans passed a similar repeal bill and instructed the committees to come back with alternatives. It never happened, and it will never happen again. They might have a few good ideas here and there, but they have never come up with a comprehensive plan to provide Americans with low-cost health insurance and to insure most Americans.

That is what we have done with the Affordable Care Act. We are not going to go back. We are not going to repeal. This is fantasy. The President will never sign it, and I just wish that they would stop wasting our time and would get to things that are actually going to make a difference to the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, talk about fantasy. I think that it finds its root in this comment from Jonathan Gruber, who was the architect of ObamaCare:

If you had a law which said that healthy people are going to pay and sick people would get money, it would never have passed. Lack of transparency is a huge political advantage. Call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever, but that was critical for the thing to pass.

Mr. Speaker, that is the fantasy on which this was based. It does not work. It has driven up costs. Indeed, we know that 70 of our Democrat colleagues have crossed the aisle and have voted with us to repeal different provisions of this law because it does not work. It is not making insurance more affordable. It is costing more.

One of my constituents is Emily. Her insurance was \$57 a month before ObamaCare. After ObamaCare, with the subsidies, it was \$373 a month. Another constituent, Jimmy, is saying he can't afford to offer the benefits now because

of the way ObamaCare has driven up the cost of insurance. It is offer insurance or close his business. Those are the choices. That is why we are here. It does not work, and it is time to get this law off the books.

Yes, there are lots of ideas. Mr. Speaker, just for my colleagues to know, at Energy and Commerce, we have over 100 bills that have been filed that would repeal different provisions of this law, and we are doing it because the American people have said, We are tired of this. It is damaging health care. It is returning us to the day of the old major medical when you had higher premiums, when you had higher out-of-pocket costs, and when you had fewer benefits.

□ 1430

Now, our colleagues across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may say that those are not suitable plans, but guess what? That is what ObamaCare plans are becoming. It is time to get it off the books and restore choice and option for the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. This bill is about restoring choice not to have insurance, not to have the assurance that if you get sick, you are going to be able to not go bankrupt. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. Speaker, this House is about to hold its 56th vote to undermine or repeal the Affordable Care Act, which came to us, by the way, by route of The Heritage Foundation, as I think probably most of you recall.

But this vote is different than the previously full repeal votes for one significant reason. Since the last repeal vote, the health insurance marketplace has opened and is working. Over 9½ million Americans have signed up through these marketplaces for health care coverage for 2015 so far. That means that with today's vote, Republicans are choosing to take away health care coverage from millions of Americans.

This vote will also remove patient protections and cost savings reforms. To make matters worse, today's vote would also defund the bipartisan popular CHIP program that helps States cover uninsured children. So it abandons children as well.

In 2011, when House Republicans voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, they included language that said they would replace it with something else; and I say to my friend, Mr. PITTS, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that, they have not done so. However, they still have failed to give us an alternative.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), a member of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this very important discussion that we are having today.

Yes, I rise in support of H.R. 596, which aims to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare. ObamaCare has been a costly disaster to my constituents in the Second District of North Carolina and across this country.

I have heard numerous stories, ranging from young women to senior citizens, and they all touch on the same underlying problem: ObamaCare is unaffordable and results in severe consequences.

As a nurse, I know that repeal alone is not enough because the American people need high-quality, patient-centered health care. I am so proud to be standing with my Republican colleagues and many of the Democrats that we serve with who are now going to say to the American people, not only are we against this awful law, but we are for good, patient-centered health care, and we are going to provide that plan of action for the American people to see.

We need to stand with the American people, who overwhelmingly disapprove of ObamaCare.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my staunch opposition to H.R. 596, legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Yesterday was Groundhog Day, yet it is today's vote that really feels familiar. The House has now attempted to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act for 56 times. It is disappointing that the Republican leadership continues its partisan campaign to undermine the ACA and create barriers for millions of uninsured Americans having access to health insurance.

Based on the latest estimate from the Congressional Budget Office, 19 million Americans—and 20,000 in our Houston area district—would lose their health insurance this year if the ACA is repealed. These are people who would be without coverage today if it were not for the ACA.

H.R. 596 would take away critical benefits and health care coverage for hardworking families. Not only that, this bill would increase the deficit, repeal reforms that help slow the growth in health care costs, and undo basic protections that provide security for the middle class.

It is long past time to stop playing political games on health reform. We need to work to enact reforms that improve and build on the ACA for the good of the American people.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, a lot of those people are on Medicaid and can't even see a doctor.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to an outstanding Member from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I have sat here today listening both to the rule debate and the debate we are having right now, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who ridicule our relief efforts and joke about the number of votes that we have taken to repeal ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle may think this is funny, but it is no joke to the folks I represent back in Pennsylvania. It is not a joke to the mother who walked into a pharmacy and found out a drug that cost \$40 under her old plan, the one that the President promised she could keep, now costs \$700 because of the skyrocketing deductibles that she has. It isn't funny to people who have received a cancellation notice in the mail and have been forced onto plans with ridiculous out-of-pocket costs. A woman I spoke to who can't go to a doctor she has seen for 20 years definitely isn't amused by ObamaCare.

There wasn't one single Republican who voted to create the train wreck that is known as ObamaCare, and we made our opposition abundantly clear to voters before we went to the ballots last November.

I urge my colleagues to give Americans what they asked for and support this legislation. Do it for every American who was lied to about the real cost of this law. Do it for the millions who have been hurt by this law, and let's find a better way forward.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

It is not a joke. It is disheartening that here we are for the 56th time again considering a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

This time it is different. This time repeal will do more than simply take away the important consumer protections that hold insurance companies accountable and make sure everyone is insurable.

This time it will actually take health insurance away from millions of families, plans they have both chosen and paid for. This time it will hit families where it hurts, raising their costs by erasing the benefits that make their insurance more affordable, as well as raising Medicare prescription drug costs.

This time small businesses who have received tax credits to make insurance affordable will lose them, leaving employees without coverage and few, if any, affordable options.

We all know that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect and there are clear areas where we could work together to build on and improve this law, but today's repeal vote would turn back time, reverting back to a system everyone agreed was broken. The American people deserve better than that from us. I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes

to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, this is my first speech on the House floor, and today I am here speaking because we are voting to repeal the unpopular and unaffordable Affordable Care Act.

Our Nation has over \$18 trillion in debt, and this law adds to it by spending more money we don't have. The cost of coverage subsidies alone is expected to quadruple over the next 10 years, according to the CBO.

The Federal Government is picking up the tab for Medicaid expansion, and it will eventually pass the enormous financial burden on to State budgets. In the last decade alone, Michigan has gone from one in eight residents enrolled in Medicaid to approaching one in four enrolled in this unsustainable government program.

What is more, this law has the effect of throwing a wet blanket on the economy. Small business owners say rising health insurance costs are their biggest concern, and the health insurance tax costs them \$688 per employee. School districts have cut the hours of part-time employees, and businesses can't afford to hire more employees because of the costs of mandated coverage. We have even seen colleges and universities cut back hours for student workers, and now they earn less money to pay for their classes.

Individuals, families, and businesses all face continuing uncertainty over health care coverage and its costs. The administration, alone, has made 28 changes to the law, including delaying mandates, changing verification requirements, pushing back enrollment dates because the Web site wasn't ready, and expanding waivers to deal with the cancellation of millions of health care plans.

Five years after it was signed, the President's health care law is still changing, and last November the Department of Health and Human Services proposed 35 more revisions. It is time to permanently repeal the excessive spending, the economic pain, and the continuing uncertainty caused by this law and replace it with patient-centered alternatives with lower premiums that allow individuals to choose the coverage they want. It is time to empower patients to take control of their health care choices.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, here is what my constituent Laurel wrote me from Wilmette, Illinois:

Thank you. I am tired of all this belly-aching about health care, so I want to share our story. We are small business owners and have a very expensive policy for our two employees, but we have been stuck with that approach because my husband and one of our kids has asthma and are therefore uninsurable.

Our health care broker just sent us all the health care information for the next year, and our yearly costs will go down if we switch to one of the ObamaCare options in

Illinois. Although we don't qualify for subsidies, it is cheaper in all scenarios. In fact, if our usage is similar to what it was the last 3 years, our costs go down 20 percent. The policy is better. Everyone in our family is now insurable. My kids who are still under 21 may be able to get dental insurance, and the out-of-pocket maximum is lowered if someone really gets sick. Wow.

She says:

These savings don't include the benefit of the no-deductible checkups and preventive drug benefits, which have already saved us \$1800 this year. Our health care broker and his partner are signing up for ObamaCare options themselves.

She says:

I would like to know what all those Republican grandstanders who have blocked action at every turn and are now wringing their hands have done for me lately.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 596, a bill that would fully repeal the Affordable Care Act offered by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

Right now, Americans are being forced to buy a government product or pay a penalty. The Constitution mandates freedom, not the purchase of health insurance or any other product.

We all remember this promise: "If you like your health care plan, you can keep it." In 2013, a reported 4.7 million people in 32 States lost their health insurance when their plans were canceled. That is just the beginning. The Congressional Budget Office projects that 7 million more Americans will lose their health-sponsored coverage in 2016.

Americans were promised that with ObamaCare their premiums would be lower. Instead, premiums have skyrocketed. Some groups have seen their premiums increase by 78 percent. At the same time, household incomes have gone down.

Today, 4 years after the passage of ObamaCare, there are still more than 41 million people without health coverage. There are millions of people out of full-time work and millions more forced into part-time jobs.

ObamaCare must be repealed and replaced. Americans should be allowed to buy the health insurance they want and need. We need market competition between health insurance providers, and people should be able to buy their health insurance across State lines. This would result in more choices for plans and at lower costs.

We need portability so that when a person changes or loses a job, they don't lose their health insurance. We need innovative reforms for Medicaid and reforms that create incentives for controlling costs, promoting healthier lifestyle choices, and reforms that treat people with dignity.

H.R. 596 starts the process of reforming our health care system by repealing ObamaCare. This is the first step toward true affordable health care that puts people back in charge of their health care choices.

□ 1445

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

This vote today marks the 56th attempt by House Republicans to dismantle the ACA. If enacted, more than 19 million people who were previously uninsured would lose tax credits and subsidies that make insurance affordable.

Members who voted for this bill are telling the American people that access to affordable, quality health care should be reserved for only those who have the means to afford it. Let me just tell you a very brief story about a man named Carlton Stevens, Jr., from my hometown of Wilson, North Carolina.

Last year was a very challenging year for the Stevens family of five as they found themselves uninsured. As Mr. Stevens and his wife found themselves between jobs and in a new town, they prioritized finding health coverage for their family.

Mr. Stevens visited the Federal Health Insurance Marketplace to search for coverage and was surprised and elated to know that he and his family qualified for a credit of approximately \$800. He and his wife were able to purchase insurance for his entire family for less than \$200.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would deprive families like the Stevens family of affordable health care in a time of need. I wonder why my Republican friends are doing this again.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the number one health care concern of the American people is cost. The President promised American families that they would see a \$2,500 reduction in premiums. President Obama was wrong.

According to one study from the Manhattan Institute, American families are seeing premium increases on an average of 49 percent.

At this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 596 which repeals the President's flawed health care law in its entirety and provides the Congress with a clean slate to implement the real, patient-centered health care reform that this Nation needs and deserves.

The majority of Americans are opposed to ObamaCare and its harmful intended or unintended side effects which have increased costs, decreased health care access, and lost jobs, work hours, and wages for many of our hard-working families.

This is an opportunity to recognize the flaws of mandates and a top-down approach to health care and allows us to finally consider ideas that will result in a health care system that empowers and encourages individuals to take control of and responsibility for their health care through the use of tools like health savings accounts and incentives that reward healthy behaviors.

We need targeted, transparent, well thought out reforms that acknowledge the complexity of our health care system, and with the right kind of reforms, we can get the right kind of health care that is affordable and accessible.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is a great help to American families.

Most Americans have health insurance through their employer. The ACA provides important consumer protections for those families. They cannot end your policy if you get sick, your copayments and premiums have to go to health services and not to profits for insurance companies, and kids aged 26 or younger can stay on your own health insurance plan.

For Americans on Medicare, the ACA is saving you money. In fact, since passage of the ACA, more than 7.9 million people who rely on Medicare have saved almost \$10 billion on prescription drugs. You have new wellness checkups, and the Affordable Care Act extended the life of the Medicare trust fund for more than a decade.

Finally, before the ACA, many Americans were barred from health insurance because of a previous diagnosis of cancer, diabetes, or something else. The Affordable Care Act has been a lifeline for them because it ended discrimination and created new marketplaces for Americans to shop for the best plan for their families.

In Florida alone, my home State, 1.5 million Floridians have already signed up for a plan in the marketplace in the upcoming year. That is 1.5 million Floridians.

Please, colleagues, don't take this away. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 596, the legislation that will repeal ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, since its passage in 2010, ObamaCare has put us on the path toward a full government takeover of the health care industry. The American people were sold on this by false promises that ObamaCare would lower the costs and increase access to care.

The first and most egregious false promise came when the President himself said:

If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what.

In reality, some 5 million Americans have lost their plans since that time and have suffered needlessly.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we were promised that premiums would go down; instead, premiums in the individual marketplace have increased by an average of 49 percent across the country. This is one of the main reasons that only 7 percent of Americans believe that ObamaCare will actually reduce the cost of care.

ObamaCare has also been a drag on the economy. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that this law will reduce the full-time workforce by some 2.5 million people. The American Action Forum reported that small business wages have already decreased by \$22.6 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, with its \$1 trillion in new taxes and \$2 trillion in new entitlement spending, we must repeal ObamaCare, and H.R. 596 does exactly that.

Additionally, we must replace this law with patient-centered, free market solutions to the problems that exist in our health care system. H.R. 596 takes the important step of directing the committees of jurisdiction to develop legislation that will do just that.

I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 596.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 596, a bill that will completely repeal the Affordable Care Act, which was signed into law in 2010 and was declared constitutionally sound by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Affordable Care Act extends health care coverage to all Americans, regardless of their gender, health condition, or ability to pay.

Unlike other Republican repeal efforts, H.R. 596 does have a bit of a new twist. This legislation instructs the appropriate committees to draft a Republican alternative to the Affordable Care Act and directs them to include provisions that will provide people with preexisting conditions access to affordable health coverage and provisions designed to increase the number of insured Americans.

I am not sure where the Republicans have been over the past 5 years, but those two provisions are already in the Affordable Care Act which is already the law of the land. In fact, the number of uninsured Americans has steadily decreased under the Affordable Care Act to a record low of 13.4 percent by the second quarter of 2014, and Gallup's quarterly trends projected that the uninsured rate will continue to drop over all age groups.

The Affordable Care Act is good law. It should not be repealed, and that is why I vehemently oppose H.R. 596. It is another very cynical attempt to take our Nation backward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the managers that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I am very surprised to have to be here today. I thought after millions of Americans said loud and clear this past November that they wanted us to work together and find common ground, we could put divisive bills like this behind us.

When I speak to voters in my district in Oregon, none of them ask me to raise taxes on the middle class which, effectively, this bill does. None of them have asked me to let health insurance plans discriminate against women or those with preexisting conditions, something this bill does. I don't know any seniors that want to pay more for prescription drugs, something that will happen if this bill becomes law.

Nobody I speak with wants the most vulnerable children to go without health insurance which will happen if this bill goes into effect, ending bipartisan support for the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Nobody I know wants to see the deficit grow, to pass on more debt to our future generations, or reduce the solvency of the Medicare trust fund—again, something that will happen if this bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think my constituents are alone in this. Americans want us to stop wasting time and come together and put this partisan nonsense behind us.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill and get our priorities in line.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of the Affordable Care Act and the millions of Americans that have received coverage under this law.

I rise today in support of the idea that in this country, the most powerful in the world, every citizen deserves access to quality affordable health care, and I rise today on behalf of the millions of children who get health insurance through the Children's Health Insurance Program which is also at risk today.

Mr. Speaker, one in five children today are on food stamps, 16 million kids under the age of 18. For the first time in 50 years, the majority of U.S. public school students live in poverty. CHIP was designed in the 1990s to try to address these kids and make sure that they had access to health care. Since then, the uninsured rate for children has dropped from 14 percent to 7 percent.

CHIP funding expires later this year and is included in this bill. More than 8 million children will lose access to health insurance. That is 150,000 children in Massachusetts alone.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to hear those 8 million voices and vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Cárdenas).

Mr. Cárdenas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 596, a bill to deny access to health care to tens of thousands of Americans with pre-existing conditions.

Americans should know that these same fear-mongering comments were made when Congress created Medicare. Today, we have millions of grandmothers and grandfathers who would not be alive today had Congress abandoned this critical lifesaving law.

I am proud to have supported the Affordable Care Act last year in the San Fernando Valley which I represent. My office helped experts sign up over a thousand families. Family after family sat there, nervous at first, but after realizing that now their family could afford to see a doctor, I personally witnessed tears of joy.

Republicans need to stop playing games with people's lives. The Affordable Care Act saves lives. ObamaCare never existed. ObamaCare is just a form of a lie. Americans need to learn that the Affordable Care Act is not what people call ObamaCare.

Millions of people will be alive today and tomorrow, and we just have to look at history in Congress to know that fear-mongering should not intimidate elected officials.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Thompson).

Mr. Thompson of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that insanity is doing something over and over again and expecting a different result. Well, here we go again, the 56th bill to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act.

We all understand that the majority needs to give their freshmen Members an opportunity to say that they voted to repeal ObamaCare, so let's call this what it really is: an exercise in futility.

It may make for good talking points in your districts, but it is bad for our country, and it is a waste of time and a waste of tax dollars. You are in charge with the biggest majority in decades, and this is what you decide to do with it?

Folks on my side of the aisle are willing to work with you on things like investing in roads, growing our economy, creating jobs, and even making improvements in the Affordable Care Act.

Our constituents sent us here to get something done, not to pass bills that

are never going to become law. So let's do something meaningful. Let's say "no" to this bill and get on to the work of the people.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how many speakers the gentleman from New Jersey has remaining. We are prepared to close, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to what my colleagues said on the other side. They keep saying they are going to come up with an alternative to the Affordable Care Act, and yet not one speaker mentioned an alternative that they have, and that is because it doesn't exist.

As I said before, 4 years ago they came up with a similar repeal bill. They said they were going to instruct the committees to come back with an alternative, and they never did, and they never will.

The fact of the matter is, if you listen to my colleagues on the Democratic side, they talked about all the positive things that have occurred because of the Affordable Care Act. Millions—almost 20 million people—who didn't have insurance before now have insurance.

Preexisting conditions, out the window. How many people weren't able to get insurance before because they had cancer or they had other preexisting conditions that made it impossible for them to get insurance, and that is not the case anymore?

Kids who are on their parents' policies, seniors who benefited from the fact that now there is no doughnut hole, and they can basically get their prescription drugs. How in the world do my Republican colleagues come here on the floor and know that all these positive things have resulted because of the Affordable Care Act and just in a moment's notice say they are going to simply repeal it and not even have an alternative to come up with at any point?

It is incredible to me that they want to turn the clock back and don't understand that people have benefited greatly from the Affordable Care Act.

Well, the bottom line is that we, as Democrats, are not going to turn the clock back. We are very proud of the fact the Affordable Care Act has accomplished so much to reform the health care system, to deal with preventative care, to make changes to the health care system that are providing good quality care, good benefits at an affordable price.

The President has said that this bill is dead on arrival. He will veto it. He will take out his veto pen.

So let's not waste our time. Fifty-six votes to repeal; I hope we don't see another one. It is simply a waste of time, and I think that my Republican colleagues, hopefully, understand that.

So, if you have some ideas for the future that you want to make improvements, you want to improve quality, you want to improve access, we will listen to them. We are more than willing to work with you on a bipartisan basis.

But we are not going back to the system that existed before where the insurance companies ran the system. We are not giving it back to the insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we have several hundred bills, a menu of options to repeal, to replace, some comprehensive, some targeted.

And I would remind the Democrats that ObamaCare cut \$716 billion out of Medicare to fund ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our great majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on a bill that we have voted on many times in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, you want to know why?

The answer is very simple. The law is a disaster. We still can't afford its costs, and the American people still don't want it.

The House, on both sides, is intimately tied to the will of the people. We talk to, we listen to our constituents every day. In our districts, we listen to them at meetings, in the grocery store, at the gas station, and in our houses of worship. And every 2 years our neighbors either send us back to Washington to fight for them or send someone else.

In the most fundamental way, their priorities are our priorities because we directly represent them. When it comes to ObamaCare, the people could not be clearer.

Mr. Speaker, you know what they have said?

They said, We don't want it. We don't want higher premiums. We don't want to be forced to buy all sorts of coverage that we don't need and can't afford.

Mr. Speaker, they have also said, We don't want to lose our doctors, as millions have. We don't want to give control over our health care decisions to Washington bureaucrats. They have simply said, We don't want it.

But for years, the President hasn't listened.

Now, House Republicans have three priorities. We want to increase freedom, promote opportunity, and hold government accountable.

ObamaCare is against all those goals with its outdated, top-down approach. It limits opportunities by destroying the 40-hour workweek and saddling Americans with more costs. It empow-

ers a government that mismanaged the VA and gives them even more control over American health care systems.

We need a new system. We need a system that puts the patients first, one that controls costs through competition and expands coverage by choice, not coercion. That is the system the House is developing right now.

So if you ask why we are voting to repeal this law again, we are doing it for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that every Member of this House who has a direct relationship with their district to listen. But, at the end, have the wisdom to listen but the courage to lead and vote "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time has expired for the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 596, legislation to repeal the President's controversial and expensive health care law, a law that put 159 Federal agencies, commissions, and bureaucracies in between you and your physician.

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives again acts to repeal the costly mistake known as the Affordable Care Act. In the years since the law's passage, too many Americans have discovered the reality behind the President's promises.

Americans lost plans that they liked and wanted to keep. They saw their premiums soar, and their deductibles, and they discovered their family doctor was suddenly out of network and unaffordable.

They saw their hours reduced at work, and hiring slowed as a result of the law's \$1 trillion in new taxes. They realized that, under the law, more work doesn't necessarily mean more pay.

They saw their tax dollars risked on insurance organizations that are now failing. They tried, frustratingly, to navigate the complicated health care site to get help buying what turned out to be more costly coverage. And soon, millions of unsuspecting Americans may learn that errors beyond their control could leave them on the hook to the IRS.

Today's action is not simply opposing the Affordable Care Act. It is about standing up for our families, patients, small businesses, and local health care providers who have been hurt by this law.

The American people deserve better than this. We need to start over, and that begins with the full repeal of the President's health care law.

But we can't just stop there. We also have to continue to advance our own patient-centered solutions to the problems in health care, solutions that actually lower the cost of health care; to make our current system more fair; to

protect the most vulnerable; and put our crucial safety net programs on a path to sustainability for the long term.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will allow us another opportunity to put forward these ideas, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Speaker, well, the majority leader says we need a new system. This has been for 4 years their new system—a total blank page.

Their problem is that it is working, that health care is working. It is working for these people: 12 million uninsured Americans who got coverage; over 10 million enrolled in Medicaid and CHIP; 3 million young adults, 3 million who are now covered because of their parents' health policy.

It is working. It is working for the 129 million Americans with preexisting health conditions, so many of whom were out in the cold; for 105 million Americans who no longer have a lifetime limit or an annual limit; and for seniors who got the benefit of filling the doughnut hole.

There is some reference here to increased health care costs. It is a lie. Health care costs have been going down. It is a fib. It isn't true.

I think what bothers Republicans most of all is that it is working, and their ideology is blind to success, or they don't want to see it.

We are going to vote "no." What is this, the 56th time? We have lost track of how many times we voted "no."

We are voting "no" because of the millions of people who were left out by our insurance coverage, who now have the decency of health care coverage and the protection of health care coverage.

We are proud of health care reform, so we stand up to say "yes" to it by voting "no."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), one of the health care leaders on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a nurse for over 40 years, I saw how decisions in Washington affected the real people. I witnessed the effects of Congress' action on my patients' faces and in their billing statements.

I understand better than most the need for health care reform, but ObamaCare was never the way to do it. Just ask the 16,000 Tennesseans who lost their health insurance through Cover Tennessee, despite the President's promise "if you like what you

have, you can keep it," or the 11 million small business employees who CMS says will see their premiums spike because of the law.

The results are in. ObamaCare was a mistake that hurts the very people it pretends to help. And that is why, today, I will vote to repeal this law once and for all.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who has worked on health care for how many years, Mr. RANGEL?

Mr. RANGEL. A million and one.

Thank you for this opportunity to try to figure out what is going on on the floor today. Normally, Republicans are rational, intelligent people, and that is the reason why they keep talking about ObamaCare.

It is clear to me that we are not voting on ObamaCare. I haven't seen ObamaCare in any of the papers we have today, so they must be saying that they want to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. That makes it easier to understand what they want to do.

They want to repeal health care, and they want to replace it with, well, they want to—I don't know what they want to do, quite frankly, but I know they want to get rid of this.

I think we have reached the point that we have exhausted the legislative process. I have figured it out. This Senate is prepared to join with them in this insanity. The only thing missing is the President of the United States.

Now, they must have a plan how they are going to pick up two-thirds of this House and two-thirds of the Senate to tell the world: We don't want Americans to have health care.

Now is the time for the spiritual leaders to come in, because I have been reviewing the Bible, and Christians, Jews, everybody says that we have a moral obligation, far beyond our legislative responsibility, to give the sick an opportunity to get well, to allow children the opportunity to breathe.

And I know the concerns for the unborn that we all have. But what about the born, the aged, the disabled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RANGEL. So collectively, we all have to—in God we have to trust. This means we have given up on the process—55, 56 times. It is time to trust in God.

So I am calling upon all of those solid voices there that were waiting to see whether sanity could ever come to the well of this House, and I think we have proven today, don't count on us, God. We need your help. And only God can get us out of this rut.

Thank you for the opportunity.

□ 1515

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr.

EMMER), one of the new Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. EMMER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Representative BRADY, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the urgent health needs of this Nation. I asked my constituents to share with me how ObamaCare has affected them, and I want to share a few of their stories with you today.

Troy, from Norwood Young America, wrote that his family's premium went up and coverage went down, drastically affecting the cost of his son's hearing aid.

Brian, from Albertville, said his wife's mental health clinic has steadily lost clients due to regulations.

Today, Congress will vote to get rid of this fundamentally flawed and unworkable law, but this cannot be for show. It is not enough for Congress to simply be against ObamaCare. We need to offer alternatives. By offering market-based, consumer-focused reforms, we can find real solutions, and I am committed to working with my colleagues to get it done. It is time to stop playing party politics with the public's health.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Dr. McDERMOTT.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I feel like I am telling a story told to children. The story to the children is this:

When President Obama became President, most people didn't live in the house of health. There were 30 million people who were out in the street who had nothing. So President Obama built them a house and said everybody can live in the house of health and have health care.

Their next-door neighbor didn't like the house, complained about the house, said there was everything wrong with the house, and has tried 55 times to blow the house down, just like the Big Bad Wolf in the "Three Little Pigs." This time, they have come with a bulldozer, and they want to knock the house down and put everybody out in the street again.

Now, this would be not so silly if it wasn't for the fact that they have no plans to build anything for the people to live in. They have talked for 5 years: We have plans. We have a committee. We are going to have plans here any day now.

The fact is they have no plan for the people. They simply say to the American people: We want to knock down your house of health. Your preexisting condition will now keep you from health care. Your kids are off before 26. All of this is going to happen because we don't think you should have a house of health in this country.

They have no plan, and they know it, and they are ashamed of it. But they can't stand the fact that Mr. Obama

built a house that covered everybody. It is a glorious creation.

Is it perfect? No.

Did they come over with a hammer or paint or something to change it? No.

It was always: Knock that house down.

Folks, vote “no.” Keep the house up.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. WALTERS), a businesswoman and former State legislator who understands the harm of the Affordable Care Act.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, over 4 years ago, ObamaCare was signed into law and sold to the American people on numerous false promises. Americans were promised that premiums for a typical family would go down. The President told Americans, if you like your health care plan, you can keep it, and, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. However, that was not true, and now many Americans are grappling with a very different reality.

As a result of ObamaCare, millions of Americans have seen their health care plans canceled, families are finding that they may not get to keep the doctor that they like, and premiums in the individual market are increasing by 41 percent in the average State.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. Instead of putting the Federal Government in the driver's seat of our Nation's health care decisions, we need solutions that will protect the doctor-patient relationship, foster economic growth, and empower patients by giving them the choice and control.

Today, I am pleased to stand in support of H.R. 596, legislation that would not only repeal ObamaCare, but would instruct the House to come forward with a patient-centered, free market alternative.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 596.

You would think that if my friends on the other side cobbled together all of the time they have spent trying to undermine the ACA, they should have been able to come up with an alternative for this law, the law they can't find anything good to say about, but I am not holding my breath for that.

While we have been here 55 times before, including my Republican colleagues shutting down the government over ACA—let's not forget that. You shut the place down in trying to stop ACA. Oh, by the way, you don't know how much that cost, the billions of dollars in jobs. But we will overlook that today. Today is different because they are now repealing the law after the major coverage expansion provisions have gone into effect.

Today's vote to repeal the ACA means taking away health insurance

for the 19 million Americans who receive coverage under ACA, including 213,000 people from my home State of New Jersey; second, ending the tax credits 85 percent of Americans with coverage through the exchange are using to help offset the premiums and requiring them to pay back the tax credits they already received; and third, among the many reasons, seniors losing the new Medicare benefits the ACA created, such as lower drug costs and free preventive services.

I want to be there when you tell the seniors in your district that are covered under this plan that they don't have it anymore. I want you to tell them how much it is going to be increased on prescription drugs. You stand there. Don't pontificate on this floor. Go to your district. Tell the people what you are doing.

Before the ACA, many people were paying for plans that didn't provide them with the coverage they needed. The plans they purchased had high out-of-pocket costs and artificially low caps on coverage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Through the Chair, my friend from Texas—I call him my friend, I think, sincerely—I agree with him that we want results from what we are spending on health care. We want to see the results, results-oriented, absolutely. That is what health care reform and the ACA are all about.

We are removing ourselves from the fee-for-service, which had made patients prisoners of hospitals. The gentleman from Texas agrees with me on that, I believe. Make the ACA better. Help us improve it for a change. The gentleman knows there are good things in this bill and in this law. Help us make it better for the American people.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), a new Member of Congress and a former State legislator who helped lead the fight against the damage caused by the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, one of the best things we can do in Congress to create an environment for more good-paying jobs is to repeal ObamaCare.

Under ObamaCare, health insurance premiums have gone up, access to quality care has gone down, and doctors all over this great land are plotting their exit strategies—not to mention the chilling effect this law has had on our economy, resulting in lost jobs all over America.

It is a simple fact that if you are going to get the best product for the lowest possible price, you must have competition and transparency. We have very little of either in the health care sector today, and ObamaCare, with all

its rules and mandates, has made it that much worse.

If we want to do right by the American people, we should allow individuals and families to buy insurance across State lines, let small businesses and other groups establish associated health plans so they can pool their resources and have the leverage to buy health insurance at lower rates, and we should let individuals and families set aside money in health savings accounts tax free.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the simple, commonsense steps we can take to help drive down costs. The American people know that ObamaCare is not the answer, and those seeking a good-paying job definitely know it. So let's do what is right. Let's repeal this disastrous law and start anew.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of our committee and also the vice chair of our Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I heard my friend, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), as she was finishing her remarks and leaving, she said—I somewhat quote—she hopes this repeal of the ACA will, once and for all, be the end of the ACA. “Once and for all.”

If they have done it once, they have done it 56 times. This is not one time. It is 56 times they have wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act—56 times.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are probably pretty proud of themselves. After all, Joe DiMaggio, he had a 56-game hitting streak, something people say will never be equated again.

But unlike “Joltin’ Joe,” this one isn't a streak of hits. It is a streak of losses, a streak of strikeouts for the American people. It is a streak of being willing to sacrifice the health and well-being of your constituents just to make a cheap political point.

This majority is apparently ready and eager to actually take away health coverage. As my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) said, try explaining this to your constituents back home. Take away the health coverage that people have purchased and have been using for over a year.

They would make people, particularly seniors, pay back the tax credits that helped them afford the coverage in the first place. They would ask their seniors to go back to pinching pennies to afford prescription drugs and even force them to repay the rebate check they received for their high prescription drug costs. They would put insurance companies back in charge of what kind of health care you can get and when you can get it and how much it is going to cost.

That is not a win to me. That is not something to celebrate. It is something you should all be ashamed of.

Mr. Speaker, you are no Joe DiMaggio. Some streaks put you at the

top. This one puts you at the bottom. And, unfortunately, it puts the American people on the bottom as well.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has quickly become a leader on health care issues.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the comment numerous times, "If you like your health care, you can keep it," what the President had said. Mr. Speaker, we know that that was not true. I would like to give you an example of just one of thousands that I have had from my district.

This comes from Frank. When he contacted our office, he said:

My first personal introduction to ObamaCare was a cancelation notice on December 31, 2014.

He said:

I wasn't canceled for numerous claims or because of my health. I was canceled because of ObamaCare.

Let me tell you, he lost his health insurance; and this is the change from his current health insurance that he was supposed to keep to now what he has to have. His current policy premium was \$237.86. His new premium is \$531.89, an increase of 123.6 percent. His deductible on his old policy was \$2,500. His new policy deductible is \$6,350. His copay on his prior policy was a zero copay within the network. His new program has a 40 percent pay above his deductible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I thank the chairman.

So let's look at it. If you have a \$30,000 medical procedure, under his old insurance plan, he had a \$2,500 deductible. Under this new plan, with his \$6,350 deductible plus the 40 percent on top of it, he is going to be out \$15,810.

This is what my constituent Frank wrote:

ObamaCare is clearly the biggest, most costly lie that has ever been forced upon me by the Federal Government. It should be entitled what it is, the "Most Ridiculously Unaffordable Health Care Act."

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am standing here today with my colleagues asking for a vote on H.R. 596 to repeal the most ridiculously unaffordable health care act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a businessowner who has pro-

vided health care to his workers and is a leader on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 596 because I think it is time for everybody that sits in this House to listen to the American people. This is America's House. This is the House of Representatives. It is not the Republican Party who disapproves of the Affordable Care Act. It is the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter what poll you look at, whether it is Quinnipiac, Rasmussen, CBS, FOX News, Associated Press, Gallup, or Pew Research. Overwhelmingly, Americans are saying resoundingly: We do not like this bill. We disapprove of this bill.

To continue to say that somehow we are taking something from somebody, wait until the tax season hits. I am talking to people back home that do tax preparation. They are already looking at—they are at just day two of tax preparation; and, my goodness, what we were told was a lie.

Mr. Gruber could not have been more truthful when he said:

Look, we relied on the stupidity of the American people. We lied to them to get this passed.

Mr. Speaker, where I am from, you are allowed to make an honest mistake, but you are not allowed to outright lie to people. They will never forgive you for that.

It is time to repeal this horrible piece of legislation that got passed through lies. It didn't get passed through honesty. I think it is very dishonest to sit here today and say that somehow the Republicans are trying to do something to hurt the American people when the American people speak out and a great majority of them disapprove of this law.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), a small business person and a dynamic Member of our House of Representatives.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 596 to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: If this ObamaCare is so good, then why am I hearing so much from my constituents that they can't keep the insurance plans that they liked?

Many have seen their premiums skyrocket, and too many that need help have fallen through the cracks because of a flawed system where ObamaCare picks winners and losers at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote on repeal is an important first step. We will replace ObamaCare with patient-centered reforms, increasing competition and lowering costs by allowing insurance to be sold across State lines, ensuring

portability, and safeguarding individuals with preexisting conditions, all by providing freedom of choice, not more fines and taxes.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a train wreck. I urge my colleagues to support today's repeal and join me in working toward a commonsense replacement.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), a veterinarian involved deeply in health care issues.

Mr. YOHIO. I appreciate you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 596. The ACA was passed not in open, transparent government; it was passed with not one Republican's support behind it.

We hear on the other side how we are repealing it again. I think you ought to take heed to that notice that the American people sent the largest majority of Republicans back to Congress primarily to repeal this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen my own story. My family's policy—my wife's, our kids', and mine—got canceled because of ObamaCare, and through the House exchange as a Member of Congress, my premium went up \$870 extra a month. That is almost \$11,000 extra it is costing me with decreased coverage and increased deductibility, and the price went up. It was a fabrication that the prices would go down.

If this is happening to me, it is happening to everybody around America, which leads to the quality of our lifestyle decreasing, and health care is not improving because the majority of the people getting care through this are on the Medicaid system.

If you look out at the outcome around the world, our Medicaid health system is at the bottom, and that is why we need to repeal this bill and replace it with reforms we have.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we may have one additional speaker who is not here yet, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about 56, 56 times we have voted to repeal or defund this bill, but think about the hundreds of times this White House and our Democrat colleagues have tried to force tax increases on families and small businesses.

How many hundreds of times have they tried to force global warming mandates that only drive up energy costs? How many hundreds of times did they force red tape down our local businesses so that they can't possibly survive? How many millions of people have been forced into the health care plans they don't want and forced into higher monthly premiums, higher deductibles, and they can't see their doctor or their hospital or their provider?

Mr. Speaker, these numbers matter. We can do better.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready to close, so if the ranking member would like to proceed, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to conceive of a democratic society in which everyone does not have health security. When you look across the face of the Earth, every industrialized society on the face of the Earth has given health security to their people. They have had their own plan. The Germans had their plan, the Japanese had their plan, the British had their plan, and the Canadians—everybody has had their own plans.

Now, what we are arguing about here today is the President brought a plan to the Congress and tried to work with the other side, but they said: No, no, no, no.

So we passed a bill. Now, there isn't anybody in this business who has done any work in any legislative body who believes that you can write a perfect piece of legislation. You always have to make changes in it. You find things in it that need to be changed, and we have had no help whatsoever of bringing out the kind of changes that would make sense to make this bill work for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, when you get sick, you are not a Democrat. When you get sick, you are not a Republican. You are not in the Tea Party, and you are not on the left. You are just sick, and you want some help. That is why this bill is way beyond partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, I had a conversation with Bill Frist. About a year and a half ago, he wrote an editorial in which he said: Don't repeal, fix.

I called him up and said: You and I ought to work together and see if we can't work with the Republican caucus. Maybe you can get into them. They won't talk to me about working together.

He said: Well, I will do what I can.

But we never got there. Everybody knows that you do not want to have a situation tomorrow where you have a preexisting condition and you have no health insurance. That is the kind of thing you are creating by repeal. It is just a bad bill. Just put it aside, and let's work on it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. BRADY, are you ready to close?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) to speak about health care and the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. BRAT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of repeal. ObamaCare came with many

promises, but the American people are finally getting the bill in the mail, and they don't like what they see.

We were promised lower costs, but we have seen most premiums and deductibles only skyrocket. Almost nine out of 10 people who buy insurance on the ObamaCare exchange need a government subsidy just to afford it.

Mr. Speaker, as I have traveled my district, I have talked with countless small business owners who think of their employees like family, and they already provide health care coverage for their fine workers; but now that ObamaCare is forcing them to buy more expensive insurance, many are having to lay off their own employees or convert them to part time to avoid these skyrocketing costs.

At a time when we should be growing the economy, ObamaCare is forcing businesses to lay off people, cut their hours, and cut off their health care coverage. Health care in America certainly had problems before this law, but ObamaCare has been a cure worse than the disease.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. BRADY, are you ready to close?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. In a moment, sir, yes, sir. So if you would like to close, we will follow.

Mr. LEVIN. And then you will close?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, February 2, 2015.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 596—REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE
ACT

(Rep. Byrne, R-AL, and 48 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 596. The House has now attempted to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act more than 50 times. H.R. 596 would take away critical benefits and health care coverage from hard-working middle class families. In addition to taking away Americans health care security, the bill would increase the deficit, remove policies that have helped slow health care cost growth and improve the quality of care patients receive, and detract from the work the Congress could be doing to further job creation and economic growth.

The Affordable Care Act is not only working, it is hilly integrated into an improved American health care system. Discrimination based on pre-existing conditions is a thing of the past. And under the Affordable Care Act, we've seen the slowest growth in health care prices in nearly 50 years, benefiting all Americans.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act would mean that Health Insurance Marketplaces where millions of Americans now compare private insurance plans and get tax credits to purchase them would shut down. Tax credits for small business owners who cover their employees would be taken away. States would lose substantial Federal assistance under Medicaid to provide coverage for the neediest Americans. According to the most recent projections by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), 27 million Americans are expected to gain coverage due to the law.

Repeal will likely result in most of these individuals remaining uninsured or losing their insurance altogether. An estimated 10 million Americans gained coverage during 2014, and repealing the law would erase most of these coverage gains and strip these Americans of the security and peace of mind they now have.

Further, repealing the health care law would have implications far beyond Americans who have or will gain insurance.

More than 250 million Americans with insurance private insurance, Medicare, and Medicaid would lose the benefits and protections they receive under the health care law. Insurance companies would no longer have to cover as dependents millions of young adults who have been able to stay on or sign up on their parents' plans. Lifetime limits and restrictive annual limits on coverage could be reimposed. Women could be charged more than men and up to 129 million Americans with pre-existing conditions would be at risk of not being able to access or afford health coverage. Policies that promote efficiency and accountability in health care and health insurance would be erased.

Reforms that strengthen Medicare's long-term finances also would be repealed. Seniors also would lose the more generous prescription drug coverage provided under the health care law, as well as free preventive care, and Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund would become insolvent years earlier. Moreover, by repealing these reforms to Medicare and other reforms that encourage doctors and hospitals to provide efficient, high-quality care, the legislation would drive up costs and worsen patient care throughout our health care system.

CBO has previously estimated that repealing the health care law would add more than \$100 billion to the deficit over the ten years ending in 2022, and more than \$1 trillion in the following decade. This not only hurts the Government: it hurts State and local economies, job creation, and the Nation's long-term prosperity.

The last thing the Congress should do is reflight old political battles and take a massive step backward by repealing basic protections that provide security for the middle class. Right now, the Congress needs to work together to focus on the economy, helping middle-class families, and creating jobs.

If the President were presented with H.R. 596, he would veto it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this came from the President. The President said, when he ran for office, "Yes, we can." He came here and eventually secured a majority to pass a bill to rectify 75 years of inaction, 75 years for Americans without health care by the millions, and so we did it.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have said, "We will," but they never have. We have never seen a bill that addressed this issue comprehensively. Now, they are on the run because millions and millions of people have now benefited for a variety of reasons who never had a single hour of health care for themselves or their children. Now, the Republicans say, "We will come up with something." It is too late.

Health care reform is here to stay. We can improve it, but Republicans will never destroy it. The American people know it is complex, but they know their health needs. We responded. We responded.

That should be and is respected, not the disrespect of coming here 56 times

to say “no” when they have never come up with anything.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Frightened—in the days before this health care law was brought to the floor, Democrats were meeting in the White House in secret, cutting special deals, trying to find a way to pass this bill because they were frightened that if they did it in the public, out where the people could see what they were creating, that they would fail.

The night they brought it to the House floor, they were frightened that the American public would know what was in it. They brought it to the floor, and literally no one on this floor knew what was in this bill. They were frightened about what the American public would believe.

Since it has passed, frankly, too many Americans are frightened by what they have been exposed to, which is forced into health care plans. They had good ones in their business, and now, they are forced into ones that cost more, the deductibles have soared, and they can't see their local doctor or go to their local hospital or even pay for medicines for their children because of this health care plan.

Democrats at the time didn't allow a vote on any other alternative—no ideas, no options—because they were frightened the American public could see there is a better way.

The question today, Mr. Speaker, is: Can we do better? Can we do better than this law? Yes. It has helped some but has hurt so many more.

Today is about taking the first step to allowing a better option for American families, providers, and patients by first repealing this controversial and troubling law and then bringing to the floor—directing our committees to bring a better idea to the floor so that the American public has a chance for real, affordable health care that is directed toward them—not Washington—that goes with them from job to job and State to State, home to raise a family or to start that small business, one that is tailored to them, not Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this law is about not top down, but bottom up; and it is long overdue. I support and strongly urge repeal of the health care law and passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate by the Ways and Means Committee has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

□ 1545

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in strong support of H.R. 596.

By now, we have heard all the stories. From canceled plans to higher

deductibles to longer wait times at your doctor, ObamaCare is full of broken promises. Everywhere I go in southwest Alabama, I hear a different story about how this law is having a negative impact on families, small businesses, doctors, and hospitals.

The problems aren't just in Alabama. Nationwide studies show that under ObamaCare, individual premiums have gone up by an average of 49 percent and deductibles have skyrocketed for the average American family to the point where many people can't afford to pay their deductibles. How is that affordable?

Even worse, only 7 percent of Americans believe that this health care law will reduce their health care costs. Seven percent—that is astonishing.

I don't believe ObamaCare can be fixed through piecemeal reforms. I think the only way to truly get rid of this harmful law is to repeal ObamaCare in its entirety. For the first time, Republicans now have control of the Senate, and Senate Democrats can no longer stand in the way of having this legislation brought up for a vote.

This also marks the first full repeal vote since the law has been in implementation. Right now, American families are sitting around their kitchen table to do their taxes and realizing yet another area where this law has caused a confusing maze of requirements that must be properly navigated in order to avoid government penalties. And we have been told that millions of Americans will have to pay penalties.

We were told we would like the law once we found out what was in it. The opposite has proven to be true. We were told that we could keep our health care plans and keep our family physicians. That is also not true. The more we learn about this law, the less it makes sense.

Today's vote is not just about getting rid of ObamaCare, it is about charting an appropriate path forward.

My legislation instructs the appropriate House committees to move forward with alternative solutions to improve our health care system based on patient-centered reforms that aren't run by the Federal Government. I look forward to being a part of that process.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to champion this legislation on behalf of families in southwest Alabama and all across America who have been negatively impacted by this law, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 596.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to H.R. 596.

As the new ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I know that protecting access to affordable health care for America's workers and families is a high priority. Despite scare tactics and misinformation, the bottom line is that the Affordable Care Act is work-

ing. Perhaps those who want to repeal the Affordable Care Act have a short memory. It is important to remember why the Affordable Care Act was passed in the first place.

Before the ACA, employer-provided coverage was shrinking. More and more employers were dropping coverage altogether. There were months in 2008 and 2009 when 14,000 people a day were losing their health insurance because employers were not providing it and because it was above their ability to pay. From 1999 to 2010, the cost of premiums for employer-provided health insurance increased by 138 percent while workers' earnings only went up around 40 percent. And those who were employed were often locked into their employment for fear of losing their health care insurance because even though they wanted to retire, they couldn't get insurance somewhere else, and so they were stuck in that job.

Every American family with insurance had to pay a hidden tax of approximately \$1,000 per family for the cost of paying for those without insurance who would go to the hospital and not pay, and so when they went to the hospital, they would have to pay a little extra. That little extra was about \$1,000 per year for every family with insurance. This was the reality that American workers and their families faced before the passage of the Affordable Care Act. We should not go backwards.

Today, thanks to the ACA, workers are enjoying the peace of mind that they have options. If employer-provided coverage is not available, they can enter the marketplace. If it is available, they have the security of new consumer protections such as the requirement that at least 80 percent of the premiums be spent on actual health care, not corporate jets and CEO bonuses. And we ended insurance practices such as caps on payments that would only pay so much overall and then you are on your own, or so much for your lifetime and then you are on your own. And cancellations where they could just arbitrarily cancel your insurance after you have paid premiums year after year. You get sick, and they check and just want to cancel your premium. Those abuses can no longer take place.

Employers will also suffer under a repeal. In 2014, premiums for employer-provided health care grew at the lowest rate in 15 years. If the ACA is repealed, many employers could again be charged health-related premiums, so if they have a few sick employees, they will see their premiums skyrocket. The vast majority of large employers who provide health insurance to their employees may suffer an increase in premiums due to the return of the hidden tax, the cost shifting of uncompensated care.

And when employees leave a job, they are on their own to get insurance, if they can, because there was a prohibition that they could deny people with

preexisting conditions. So if you have a preexisting condition and leave your job, who knows what is going to happen.

In addition, small employers would suffer since all small group market reforms, including rating reforms, would disappear. Small employers used to pay 18 percent more in premiums than large businesses, on average. ACA leveled the playing field so now they are paying rates like everybody else. If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, they are up another 18 percent, where it was before.

Now we have heard all of the statistics: over 3 million uninsured young adults have access to health insurance through their parents' policies; 8 million senior citizens in the so-called Medicare doughnut hole have been getting relief and have saved billions. Twelve million more Americans have health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act.

These numbers represent real people, and these real people would lose access to their benefits if the Affordable Care Act is repealed. Those trying to repeal the law should be honest to seniors about what would happen to their free preventive care in the absence of the Affordable Care Act. They should explain to young adults that repealing the law would kick them off their parents' policies. They would have to explain to millions of Americans who only have insurance because of the Affordable Care Act—many for the first time in their lives—why they will now have to go without coverage.

And while the Republican majority continues to talk about repeal, we should be talking about the progress we have already made and how we can continue to move in the right direction. So when the Republicans talk about replacement of legislation, it is important to note that there is no meaningful replacement proposal on the table. Delaying the effective date of this repeal for 180 days does not make a meaningful replacement any more plausible or likely.

This is the 56th attempt to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act. This is a distraction, and I hope the Republican majority will refocus efforts on real policy solutions for the American people, American families, and workers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip of this House, who has not just traveled around his district talking to people harmed by this law but has traveled around the United States of America.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor to repeal the President's health care law.

It was back in 2010 when then-Speaker PELOSI infamously said:

We have to pass the bill so you can find out what's in it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we know what is in the bill. American people across the country have seen the devastating impacts of the President's health care law. Millions of people have lost the good health care that they had that they liked. We all heard the promise: If you like what you have, you can keep it. The promise was broken to millions of people.

And not only did they lose good health care, but many, many millions of people have seen dramatic increases. They are paying double-digit increases for the health care that they do have. And what is worse, Mr. Speaker, is we have seen that vital doctor-patient relationship violated now by unelected bureaucrats in Washington who have come in between the doctor and the patients to make decisions on people's health care. That is not the way to do reform. That was the old way, the Washington-knows-best way.

There is a better way, and this bill starts that process by first repealing the law in its entirety and then getting the committees of jurisdiction involved, putting an alternative in place with a shot clock of 180 days where we can come up with a real bipartisan alternative. Let's repeal this law, and let's restore the doctor-patient relationship.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is week five of the 114th Congress, and I really feel like that movie "Groundhog Day," where the same day just keeps repeating itself over and over and over again. This is the 56th time that we have been through this particular exercise, repealing the Affordable Care Act here in the House. We get it. Republicans want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Go ahead and try to get President Obama's signature on that piece of legislation. It ain't going to happen. But here we go again and again and again.

We are considering recycled political gimmicks that everyone here knows deprive the American people of affordable health care and won't create a single job and would increase our deficit by over \$200 billion.

By the way, there is an accounting trick in the Ryan budget. What the Republican budget does is it keeps all of the ObamaCare taxes and gets rid of all of the benefits. That is the worst of both worlds. The Republicans want you to pay for ObamaCare and not get it. Does that make any sense, Mr. Speaker? We are starting to see the dangers of this strange "Groundhog Day" brand of so-called policymaking.

This is what happens when we abandon regular order. We don't have mark-ups in committee, we don't have hearings—to jam through partisan legislation under a closed process without an opportunity to even suggest what might replace the Affordable Care Act or what kind of health care policy we want to help make health care more affordable in our country.

This bill would leave 27 million Americans out in the cold without health care. What about even more Americans who wouldn't have coverage for preexisting conditions or who wouldn't have access to affordable prescription drugs?

This bill would mean real harm and real hardship for people in my district—couples like Mike and Lynn in Loveland, whose health care cost more than their mortgage before the Affordable Care Act. It cost \$850 a month. But thanks to the Affordable Care Act, they were able to find a plan that costs \$200 a month. Or people like Robin in Eagle County in my district, who could barely afford \$600 a month in health care costs but now, thanks to the Affordable Care Act and the tax credits, pays just \$132 a month.

Another constituent of mine didn't go to the doctor for years because he was uninsured. But because of the Affordable Care Act, he was eligible for the Medicaid expansion. For the first time he received a colonoscopy and doctors discovered and removed a precancerous polyp. Without ACA, that might have become a cancer, costing him his life, not to mention the tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money for that procedure that were saved thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

We can do better. We can escape this endless loop, this "Groundhog Day," and start talking about real job-creating legislation, improvements to health care that Democrats and Republicans can agree on because they make sense for our country. There are real lives at stake. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a new member of the Education and the Workforce Committee and a new Member of this body.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you in support of H.R. 596 for three reasons. First, of all, I am a member of the middle class. Secondly, I am an employer. I was an employer of a small business and had employees. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, I am a health care professional, the only pharmacist in Congress. And I can tell you that the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is destroying health care that I have worked in for over 30 years, and I refuse to step aside and let that happen.

Mr. Speaker, the ACA has increased costs, increased deductibles, and decreased coverage for the middle class. That is not what it was supposed to do.

For employers, it has increased costs and decreased the coverage for their patients and, most importantly, for health care, Mr. Speaker.

What ObamaCare has done is to drive the free market out of health care. You don't see any more independent pharmacies. You don't see any more independent doctors. They are all members

of health care systems or hospitals employed by them. There are only three or four major pharmacies now, and we are heading more toward that.

□ 1600

You don't see patients having a say in their drug coverage anymore. Drug therapy is decided not by a pharmacist, not by a doctor, not by the patient, but by insurance companies and government. ObamaCare has to end.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the following letters in opposition: one from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security & Medicare, another from Easter Seals, another from the AFL-CIO, and another from the SEIU.

FEBRUARY 2, 2015.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I urge you to oppose H.R. 596, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act (ACA) would be detrimental to Americans of all ages: It would undercut the ability of marketplace insurance plans to offer affordable health coverage to individuals, including those with pre-existing conditions. Repeal would mean that young adults could no longer count on remaining on their parents' insurance plans until age 26. In addition, the number of uninsured "young seniors," aged 50-64, would increase, leaving them in poorer health by the time they are eligible for Medicare—thereby increasing Medicare's costs.

Repealing the ACA would also eliminate many of that law's provisions that benefit Medicare beneficiaries today, including help with prescription drug costs and preventive screenings and wellness visits with no out-of-pocket costs. In addition, the payment and delivery system reforms that are being implemented due to the ACA are slowing the rate of increase in health spending while improving the care that is being provided, especially care to people with multiple chronic conditions. Slowing the rate of increase in health spending has also lowered costs for beneficiaries—the Part B premium has stayed level for three years in a row—and is extending the solvency of the Part A trust fund.

We oppose H. R. 596 because it interferes with the ability of marketplace insurance plans to offer affordable health coverage, and hurts millions of seniors who benefit from the Medicare improvements contained in the ACA. The National Committee strongly urges you to vote against this anti-senior legislation.

Sincerely,

MAX RICHTMAN,
President and CEO.

FEBRUARY 3, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Easter Seals is writing to request that you vote no on HR 596, legislation to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA). This law provides critical access to appropriate and high quality health care services that is essential for people with disabilities to live, learn and work and play in their communities. Easter Seals is the leading non-profit provider of services for individuals with autism, developmental disabilities, physical and mental disabilities, and other special needs.

One of the most important provisions in the ACA is the policy under which insurance companies can no longer refuse to cover children with disabilities and other pre-existing conditions. This provision came into affect on September 23, 2010. For children served by Easter Seals and their families, this provision can transform a family. Prior to the law, families would lose coverage of their child with cerebral palsy, epilepsy or another condition. The only way that the family could get the services their child needed was to pay out of pocket. For many families, they had no choice but to take out a second mortgage, declare bankruptcy, or have their child go without the services he or she needs to be healthy and strong.

The goal of the health care reform law is to assure that all people have access to quality, affordable health care and long term services and supports that meet their individual needs. It is through these types of changes to the health care system that we can hope to enable all Americans, including people with disabilities and chronic conditions, to be healthy, functional, live as independently as possible and participate in their communities.

Please vote NO on HR 596. Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE BEH NEAS,
Executive Vice President for Public Affairs.

FEBRUARY 2, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I urge you to vote against H.R. 596, legislation that will repeal the Affordable Care Act (ACA). In pursuing yet another vote against the health reform law, the House Republican leadership persists in its campaign to undermine the coverage expansions of the ACA, erecting barriers that will keep millions of uninsured Americans from accessing coverage under the law.

Based on the latest Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate of the ACA coverage expansions, 19 million U.S. residents would lose coverage in 2015 if the ACA is repealed—people who would lack coverage today if not for the ACA. CBO also estimates that 36 million individuals remain uninsured today, even with the expansion of coverage through the marketplaces and Medicaid.

In large part, millions remain uninsured because a number of governors and state legislatures have refused to pursue an expansion of their Medicaid programs or have prohibited government agencies from providing ACA enrollment assistance to the residents of their states. Twenty-two states have refused to extend Medicaid coverage to lower-income residents, turning away coverage that is almost completely subsidized by the federal government. Other states refuse to provide education and assistance to people who need help negotiating the complex decisions involved in applying for coverage. The Kaiser Family Foundation found that the lack of information about enrollment choices is making it difficult for many individuals to access coverage that is available to them.

This partisan resistance to the ACA coverage expansions at the state level is bolstered by these votes to repeal the ACA in Washington. It is time to break the partisan deadlock on health care reform and to focus on needed changes that will strengthen, not weaken, family health security—reforms that both improve and build upon the ACA.

We can begin improving the ACA to expand access to affordable coverage by eliminating the 40 percent excise tax on health benefits, by basing eligibility for premium subsidies on the costs of family coverage, and by ensuring that new fees intended for commercial insurance issuers will not apply to nonprofit

coverage. We hope that bipartisan attention will be focused soon on productive ways of addressing needed modifications to the ACA.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs Department.

FEBRUARY 3, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), I urge you to oppose H. R. 596, a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act (ACA). H.R. 596 puts millions of working families' financial security and health at risk by eliminating essential consumer protections, access to affordable coverage, and higher quality care made possible by the ACA.

Already, about 100 million Americans are benefiting from the ACA. Prior to the ACA, millions of Americans did not have access to health insurance, or were only able to obtain insurance that was costly but did not provide the coverage they needed. However, the ACA changed that reality. Due to the ACA, no longer are insurance companies allowed to discriminate against women or those with pre-existing conditions by charging them more for coverage or refusing to provide them with coverage at all. As a result of the ACA's closure of the Medicare drug coverage gap, older Americans now have relief from excessive drug costs that forced many to go without medically necessary medications. Furthermore, the ACA promotes preventive care, which helps us all, regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, or income, avoid the development of more serious chronic conditions that prevent us from living long and healthy lives. These are just of the few ways that the ACA has bettered the day to day lives of Americans.

Perhaps most significantly, people are getting covered. In fact, 9.5 million consumers have signed up to receive coverage through ACA marketplaces, millions more signed up for Medicaid, and the number of uninsured in America has dropped by 10 million people. No longer do working families have to worry about being one accident or illness away from bankruptcy. We cannot take actions that force people to go without coverage they desperately need.

There is also an untold story of the ACA. The law aims to create a more efficient system by promoting quality over quantity of care and reducing waste, fraud, and abuse in our system. The Congressional Budget Office and the Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees have found that healthcare spending is slowing at record rates. The ACA includes programs, like those that provide incentives to hospitals to reduce readmissions and encourage care coordination across settings, which aspire to further build on this trend and, most importantly, improve patients' health and experience. A vote for this bill is a vote to reverse all of this progress.

As with every major law, there are ways to improve upon the solid base the ACA provides, however, full repeal is a step backwards for millions of working families. SEIU strongly urges you to oppose H. R. 596. Votes on this legislation may be added to our congressional scorecard, located at www.seiu.org. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact Ilene Stein, Assistant Legislative Director, at 202-730-7216 or ilene.stein@seiu.org.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP),

another new Member of this body and another new member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, who brings a unique experience to this body.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years as a practicing lawyer and businessowner, I have seen firsthand how companies have tried to grow and create more jobs, but they simply can't, due to the strangling grip of ObamaCare's employer mandate.

Small businesses tell the story of how their current plan was canceled and how they were forced by ObamaCare into a health plan that covers less with higher copays and higher deductibles, along with astronomical, unsustainable increases in premiums.

Simply stated, ObamaCare is crushing small businesses across this great country. Despite the urgency of this crisis, the President has decided to dig himself in and promised to veto any commonsense reform, such as removing this employer mandate.

If the White House has decided not to collaborate with Congress to ease the burdens on families and businesses, then the only path we have is full repeal.

Along with that, Mr. Speaker, we need to move forward and develop commonsense health care reform that not only respects families and the doctor-patient relationship, but also considers any and all opportunities to lower skyrocketing health care costs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on H.R. 596.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD letters in opposition from the following organizations: the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Diabetes Association, and the American Public Health Association.

FEBRUARY 3, 2015.

*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on HR 596, which would repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA). The AAFP urges Congress not to repeal this nearly 5-year-old health care reform law, but rather focus on how the measure can be revised to improve patient care and restrain health system costs.

The ACA addresses several important persistent problems with the nation's delivery of health care. First of all, it has demonstrably improved access to health care. As the most recent Gallup poll of the uninsured shows, the uninsured rate in the fourth quarter of 2014 fell to 12.9 percent, which is the lowest since Gallup began measuring it. By comparison, 17.1 percent were uninsured at the end of 2013. This substantial decline in the uninsured rate in one year has been broadly felt since it was evident in all the demographic categories.

Second, the ACA establishes critical insurance reforms to prevent abuses such as reducing or eliminating coverage due to pre-existing conditions, or setting prohibitively high prices on the individual market based on health status. Third, it encourages innovation in health care delivery through extensive research performed by the CMS Innova-

tion Center. As recently as last week, for example, CMS announced early results of the Comprehensive Primary Care Initiative which demonstrate significant cost reductions in the first year due to investments in primary care. Fourth, the ACA requires both Medicare and private health plans to cover preventive health services (without cost-sharing), which is a proven long-term strategy to improve health while reducing costs.

There are elements of the ACA that cause the AAFP concern, including the poorly constructed Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB). Congress should carefully review these elements with an eye to improving them for patients, for physicians and other providers, and for taxpayers, generally. The AAFP will continue to offer you our support for such efforts. However, in the meantime, it is important to avoid the disruptions and turmoil that repeal of the ACA would cause.

Sincerely,

REID B. BLACKWELDER, MD, FFAFP,
Board Chair.

FEBRUARY 2, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: On behalf of the nearly 30 million Americans with diabetes and the 86 million with prediabetes, the American Diabetes Association is writing to express our opposition to HR 596, legislation that would repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA).

For the millions of people with diabetes and those at risk of developing it, the ACA provides access to quality health care that is vital to the prevention and management of diabetes, and in maintaining overall health. The law protects people with diabetes who, prior to the ACA, were discriminated against because of their disease when they sought health insurance. It also expands access to quality health care and prevention programs needed to curb the current diabetes epidemic and prevent its devastating complications, including blindness, amputation, heart disease and kidney failure.

People with diabetes are benefiting from many provisions in the law, including the elimination of annual and lifetime limits on health insurance coverage, access to free preventive care, lower prescription drug costs for seniors, allowing young adults to stay on their parent's insurance plans, and the development of a successful program aimed at preventing type 2 diabetes.

The Association is committed to working with Members of Congress and government officials on the law's implementation to ensure people with diabetes, and all Americans, have access to the health insurance they need and cannot be discriminated against because of pre-existing conditions. We urge Members of the House to oppose repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Should you have any questions or need further information, please feel free to contact Amy Wotring, Associate Director, Federal Government Affairs at awotring@diabetes.org or 703-299-2087.

Sincerely,

SHEREEN ARENT,
*Executive Vice President,
Government Affairs & Advocacy.*

FEBRUARY 2, 2015.

*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Public Health Association, which champions the health of all people and all communities by strengthening the profession of public health, sharing the latest research and information, promoting best practices and advocating for public health issues and

policies grounded in science, I write in strong opposition to H.R. 596, legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The ACA is critical to addressing the biggest challenges facing our health system including the rising costs associated with our health care system, uneven quality of care, deaths due to medical errors, discriminatory practices by health insurance providers and the shrinking ranks of the nation's primary care providers. The ACA is helping to shift our health system from one that focuses on treating the sick to one that focuses on keeping people healthy.

Under the law, millions of previously uninsured Americans now have affordable and comprehensive health insurance coverage through the health insurance marketplaces as well as through the expansion of the Medicaid program, significantly reducing the uninsured rate. This year, 9.5 million individuals have already enrolled in coverage through the health insurance marketplaces. Since its enactment, the law has provided 71 million Americans with access to preventive health care services such as vaccines, disease screenings, well-child visits and tobacco cessation counseling without co-pays or deductibles. Thirty seven million seniors have also accessed preventive services without cost through the Medicare program. More than 3 million young adults up to age 26 are able to stay on their parents' health insurance plans and nearly 129 million individuals with pre-existing conditions are protected from insurance coverage denials. In addition, the ACA provides critical mandatory funding through the Prevention and Public Health Fund for community-based prevention and wellness activities including efforts to control the obesity epidemic, reduce tobacco use and modernize vaccination systems.

Protecting the ACA and working to effectively implement this critical law to protect and improve the health of the American people will remain a top priority for APHA, and we will consider including this vote in our 2015 annual congressional vote record.

We ask you to oppose this and future efforts to repeal the ACA and we look forward to working with you to create the healthiest nation in one generation.

Sincerely,

GEORGES C. BENJAMIN, MD,
Executive Director.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another new member of the Education and the Workforce Committee and new Member of this body.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, individuals, families, and businesses alike—in Georgia and across the Nation—agree that ObamaCare is wrong for Americans. Across my district, hardworking Georgians trying to make ends meet have told me their health care premiums have skyrocketed under this law.

Many have learned the plan they liked and were promised they could keep have been canceled, and they have been denied care and access to their doctors.

In addition to hurting America's families, ObamaCare's costly mandates burden small businesses, the bedrock of job creation and entrepreneurship, and

have real consequences for their employees facing lower hours and wages.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the law will lower the number of full-time equivalent workers by 2.5 million. The President's own Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services also found that an estimated two-thirds of small businesses will see their health care premiums go up under ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 596.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly a year ago, the Republican majority held a retreat where other Members met and they set their agenda for 2014. After that retreat, the leadership issued a statement promising, with a solemn promise, that the House Republicans will rally around and pass an alternative to ObamaCare this year.

That is about 4 years after the law passed, but at least you can give them some credit that they were going to move forward in 2014 with an alternative to the Affordable Care Act.

That was last winter, and winter turned to spring, spring turned to summer, summer turned to fall, fall turned to winter, and we never had a vote in the House on the alternative, the promised alternative to ObamaCare.

Maybe the committees took action, the committees that this proposed bill is lateraling this issue off to. Did we have a committee vote on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce? No. Did we have hearings on an alternative that was promised by the majority caucus a year ago on an alternative to the Affordable Care Act? No, no hearings, no markup, no vote, no bill.

Here we are today with the majority once again throwing out a promise: Trust us. In 180 days, we will have an alternative to the Affordable Care Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in the last year, millions of Americans have moved on. Parents are insuring their kids through the Affordable Care Act up to age 26.

There are Members in the majority who take advantage of that very provision to provide coverage for their children under the Affordable Care Act that they seek to repeal here today.

Millions of seniors see their prescription drug costs cut because of the Affordable Care Act because of the leftover of the Republican prescription drug bill which led this outrageous doughnut hole that threw 100 percent of the cost of medications to seniors who were paying monthly premiums.

Yes, we saw the startup of exchanges, both at the State level—like my State in the State of Connecticut—and the Federal exchange, which have enrolled millions of Americans in affordable plans.

This year, the Affordable Care Act in Connecticut, we had submissions by

the insurance companies to participate in 2015. Did we see reduced competition? Did we see less of a free marketplace? No, we saw more competition. We have more insurers who are offering the product through the exchange in 2015 than in 2014.

Did we see rates go up? Mr. Speaker, I am going to enter into the RECORD a record from the Connecticut State Insurance Department which shows that rates went down—down—for individual plans and for small group market plans.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT INSURANCE DEPARTMENT

2014 CONNECTICUT INSURANCE RATE FILINGS FOR ON/OFF EXCHANGE 2015 POLICIES

Individual Market Requested and Approved Changes

Aetna Life Insurance Co.:

—Requested Change: 9.4%
—Approved Change: 4.60%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Celtic Insurance Company:

—Requested Change: 0.00%
—Approved Change: -6.50%
—Effective 1/1/2015

ConnectiCare Benefits, Inc.:

—Requested Change: 12.8%
—Approved Change: 3.10%
—Effective 1/1/2015

ConnectiCare Inc.:

—Requested Change: -21.50%
—Approved Change: -21.50%
—Effective 1/1/2015

ConnectiCare Insurance Co.:

—Requested Change: 1.40%
—Approved Change: 1.30%
—Effective 1/1/2015

UnitedHealthcare Ins. Co.:

—Requested Change: 0.00%
—Approved Change: -9.30%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Golden Rule Insurance Co.:

—Requested Change: 0.00%
—Approved Change: -6.91%
—Effective 1/1/2015

HealthyCT, Inc.:

—Requested Change: -8.60%
—Approved Change: -8.50%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Time Insurance Company:

—Requested Change: 25.00%
—Approved Change: 6.00%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Cigna Health and Life Insurance Company:

—Requested Change: 15.23%
—Approved Change: 8.82%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Anthem Health Plans:

—Requested Change: 12.5%
—Approved Change: -0.10%
—Effective 1/1/2015

UnitedHealthcare Life Insurance Company:

—Requested Change: 0.00%
—Approved Change: -9.20%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Average Requested Change: 3.85%

Average Approved Change: -3.18%

Estimated savings for consumers in Individual Market: \$79,099,427

Small Group Market Requested and Approved Changes

Aetna Life Insurance Co.:

—Requested Change: 5.90%
—Approved Change: 5.90%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Anthem Health Plans:

—Requested Change: 6.00%
—Approved Change: 4.40%
—Effective 1/1/2015

HealthyCT, Inc*:

—Requested Change: -13.40%

—Approved Change: -13.40%
—Effective 1/1/2015

UnitedHealthcare Ins. Co.*:

—Requested Change: 2.50%
—Approved Change: 2.50%
—Effective 1/1/2015

ConnectiCare Inc.:

—Requested Change: -1.40%
—Approved Change: -5.00%
—Effective 1/1/2015

ConnectiCare Insurance Co.*:

—Requested Change: 7.00%
—Approved Change: 7.00%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Harvard Pilgrim Healthcare of CT:

—Requested Change: 2.80%
—Approved Change: -12.00%
—Effective 1/1/2015

HPHC Insurance Co.*:

—Requested Change: -3.40%
—Approved Change: -9.40%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Oxford Health Insurance*:

—Requested Change: 10.20%
—Approved Change: 10.20%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Oxford Health Plans (CT):

—Requested Change: 10.20%
—Approved Change: 9.00%
—Effective 1/1/2015

Average Requested Change: 2.64%

Average Approved Change: 0.08%

*CID has review authority but not approval authority over these filings

Estimated savings for consumers in Small Group Market: \$9,448,203

Estimated savings for combined Individual & Small Group Markets: \$88,547,630

Mr. COURTNEY. The fact of the matter is that this marketplace, which now has more carriers, is now providing lower rates, saving close to \$90 million from last year's rates than the year before.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are being asked to do here today is to stop that progress, to take away that coverage to young adults that today get it through their parents' plans, to take away the prescription drug benefit, to take away from seniors the relief that they are getting for life-saving medications, and to tell those individual and small group plans that are purchasing it—this year, again, we have 70,000 reenrollments of the 75,000 enrolled last year, and we have 30,000 new that have enrolled this year in that plan.

We have cut the uninsured rate in a State like Connecticut that has embraced the law down to 4 percent of its population.

You are telling folks like me to blow it up, get rid of it, and you have no plan, even though your caucus made a promise a year ago to the American people that they would provide a plan, and they never came through with it.

Reject this bill.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have demonstrated ably the substantive problems with this law:

higher costs, canceled coverage, lost doctors.

I would just like to say that ObamaCare has done harm to republican government properly understood. When you go around the country telling people over and over again that they can keep their plans, that they can keep their doctors, and that they will see thousands of dollars in savings on health insurance premiums, all the while you know—or should have known—that those promises were false, I think that damages our political system because, ultimately, representative government requires honest dialogue between elected officials and the citizenry.

It is almost as if this is the Jonathan Gruber law where we want to tell people lies in order to get bills that we would not have passed otherwise. I think that is unacceptable.

These promises made to the American people were false, the American people were deceived, and I think our representative government and political system have been damaged as a result.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in support of the Affordable Care Act.

One year after implementing the health care exchanges, the number of uninsured in this country has decreased dramatically. Implementing the health care exchanges has provided health insurance access to 208,000 individuals in my district, with Charlotte accounting for one of North Carolina's highest number of subsidized health insurance enrollments.

Young adults can now stay on their parents' plans until age 26, resulting in nearly 10,000 young adults retaining health insurance in my district. Seniors in my district have saved \$11.1 million through Medicare part D prescription drug discounts.

The Affordable Care Act has also created 9.6 million private sector jobs. My district's unemployment rate is 13.9 percent, so for me, this is not just about health, but jobs and our economy.

These tangible benefits cannot be ignored. I urge my Republican colleagues to end talks of repeal and instead work with Democrats to strengthen the law.

The Affordable Care Act would have meant a lot to my sister who I often had to take to the emergency room for primary care for sickle cell. She died at age 26, but I know she would have been grateful for the coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), a new Member of the House, who is himself a dentist.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 596, legislation that I have cosponsored to fully repeal ObamaCare.

My constituents sent me to Washington to repeal this disastrous law, and that is what we are doing today, the number one issue in my district.

As a health care provider myself for 38 years, I have seen firsthand the devastating effects of ObamaCare and how it undermines the doctor-patient relationship.

It is costing us jobs and work hours and has led to millions of Americans losing their health plans that they had and wanted to keep and were promised such. Restoring the patient's right to choose a plan that they want and can afford is just plain common sense.

Our bill does this by repealing ObamaCare and replacing it with free market solutions. We put America on a path toward patient-focused care, rather than government-directed care. The traditional doctor-patient relationship would be restored.

Let's show the American people that we are listening and rid the Nation of this terrible law and replace it with policies that work.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), a colleague of ours and a distinguished veteran.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, for giving me time to express the importance of repealing what has been one of the most destructive laws ever written.

The intent of ObamaCare was to make health care more accessible and more affordable and, in fact, has done exactly the opposite.

I have heard from hundreds of my constituents who tell me how it has impacted their lives. A friend of mine from Bountiful, their premiums have doubled—have doubled. A small business owner in the southern part of my district, who found they could not get insurance at all, their plan was entirely taken away.

This law was built on a foundation of deceptions. We were told: "If you wanted to keep your doctor, you could keep them." We were told: "If you wanted to keep your plan, you could keep it." We were told it would reduce costs by an average of \$2,500 per family.

We now know that all of that is not true and that they knew at the time they passed this law that it was not true.

All of us want to take care of those who have preexisting conditions; all of us want to provide insurance to the uninsured. We can do better.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), another freshman in this House.

□ 1615

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Thank you to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, since its hasty passage in 2010, ObamaCare has been detrimental to American families, businesses, and taxpayers. Americans were promised that they could keep their health care plans and see their premiums decrease. Instead, they have been irreparably harmed by the elimination of their existing health care plans and pushed into a one-size-fits-all health care system—a system that fails to consider individual needs and that eliminates choice of physicians while families are faced with soaring premiums.

The cost of implementing ObamaCare has crippled businesses, hurting the drivers of our economy. Small and large businesses have been forced to pass these increased costs on to their employees, resulting in a decreased workforce, lower wages, and delayed hiring. ObamaCare has hurt economic growth at a time when we can least afford it, damaging our fragile economic recovery.

Put simply, a government-centered approach to health care is not the answer. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), another freshman Member and a gentleman who brings great experience to his position in this House.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, "middle class economics" is the President's new catchphrase and method to pay lip service to helping American families—more smoke and mirrors.

In November, voters spoke loudly and clearly in sending 58 Members to Washington. I made a promise over these past 2 years that I would come to Washington and stand up. Today, for the first time, I am proud to vote for a full repeal of this law.

The ACA has caused insurance premiums to skyrocket for working families in North Carolina. It continues to weigh on our economy and on our job creators. This law is seriously flawed in the fact that the President's administration has overreached dozens of times in trying to change and fix the law themselves. Yes, the damaging effects of ObamaCare are so ingrained in the fabric of this law that fixing it is not an option. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 596 for a full repeal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Alabama is prepared to close.

Mr. BYRNE. I am, and I reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 56th time we have gathered on the floor, talking past each other. The legislation that is offered by our Republican friends—a repeal—does not have any alternative. Frankly, everybody knows that it is not going to pass. If it were to be enacted into law, the President would veto it.

The facts don't justify the rhetoric. We have 10 million previously uninsured Americans. We have the lowest health care spending growth rate in 50 years. Health care premium inflation is growing at historic lows, and Medicare premiums are lower than they were before the ACA was passed, and it held steady for 3 years.

What should we be doing? Instead of trying to make the ACA worse and rail against it and get nowhere, I would suggest that we deal with things that we can agree upon.

I have been working with my colleague Mr. ROE on bipartisan legislation to deal with providers helping with end-of-life care for patients; with Representative ROSKAM, a Medicare Common Access Card, bipartisan legislation to establish a smart card pilot project to eliminate Medicare fraud; with Representative BLACK, a value-based design for better care which would establish a pilot project to test reducing or eliminating cost-sharing for seniors with high-value medications. These are things that we could do this month that would make a difference.

I hope that we stop this charade and get down to cases. The American public deserves our best efforts not to debate but to make health care better and to build on the foundation of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I have been listening carefully to the debate today. We have heard a lot from both sides, but at the end of the day, this is not about anybody in this House; this is about the American people. This is about something that is so very fundamentally important to them—their health care.

We took away the health care system that worked for 80 percent of the people of this country to fix a problem that we today know we fix for only 1 percent of the American people. Only 3 million new Americans have gotten on this new health care plan who didn't have health insurance before. That is 1 percent of the American people. We threw out the health care plan that worked for 80 percent of Americans to fix a problem for 1 percent of Americans.

Look what it has done.

It has wrecked lives. I have here from my office a sampling of emails and letters, which don't include the phone calls from people who came up to me in the over 30 town hall meetings I did

last year—women with tears in their eyes because they couldn't pay their health insurance, because they couldn't pay the deductibles when they went to the doctor or the hospital; a man who forwent going to get a particular type of surgery he needed because he couldn't pay the deductible. That is what this law has done to the people of America. It has victimized the people of America.

There is no way to fix this law. It is fundamentally flawed. We could go in and fix a problem piecemeal here and find a piecemeal resolution there. We would end up with another Frankenstein. The American people don't want Frankenstein. They don't want Groundhog Day either. They don't want the President to continue to throw stuff at them over and over again that doesn't work. They deserve a health care system that they control with their doctors, picking the health insurance programs that they want, that are not mandated by the Federal Government and that fit into their budgets. It empowers them instead of having their power taken away by some faceless bureaucracy in Washington.

Let's repeal this terrible ObamaCare law. Let's put in place a process that will give us a solution, one that works for people and what they really need. Let's get on with the business that we are here to do in order to make lives better for the American people.

I thank the majority leader, and I thank the Speaker, and I thank the whip for bringing this bill to the floor. I thank them for allowing my bill to be the one to be the package that we use today, and I ask all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 596 so the flawed Obamacare program can be reformed in order to focus on patient-centered care.

NANCY PELOSI infamously said "We have to pass the [health care] bill so that you can find out what's in it." Nearly five years later, the verdict is in: Obamacare continues to be a flawed program that created over \$1.8 trillion in new spending. It imposed over \$1 trillion in new taxes, including on those families who make less than \$250,000 a year—violating another promise made by President Obama. In fact, Obamacare's tax increases will be borne primarily by middle class Americans during a time of sluggish economic activity.

Instead of allowing individuals and families to take control of their own healthcare decisions, the health law contained 18 separate tax increases, fees and penalties that imposed mandate after mandate and resulted in over 20,000 pages of new rules and regulations. I believe a far simpler way to fix our broken healthcare system is to give individuals and families control over their own healthcare choices, such as through health savings accounts or incentives to live healthy lifestyles. Investment in prevention and wellness will not only lead to longer lifestyles for Americans but also reduce the overall cost of healthcare.

In my home state of Illinois, we have already seen the effects of Obamacare in effect. According to the Illinois Policy Institute, since 2011, Illinois has lost the equivalent of 66,000 across multiple sectors due to reduced hours or less workers in the workplace due to Obamacare's employer mandate. Illinois families in 101 out of the state's 102 counties are facing, on average, higher premium costs—in some cases those premiums are nearly 120% higher than they were before Obamacare according to the Manhattan Institute.

Finally, the President's health care law creates a limited religious conscience exemption that limits the exemption to a few select faiths. Legislation such as my EACH Act bill modestly expands the exemption so that more individuals who choose not to seek healthcare will not be fined for violating their religious beliefs.

I am proud to support this important legislation and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee on solutions to better reform our healthcare system that protect the doctor-patient relationship while also incentivizing more people to take control of their own healthcare.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this 56th Republican attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

We have been down this road before, with the same misleading rhetoric that does not reflect the true benefits of the health reform law.

This legislation is being brought to the Floor in order to give Republican Freshmen a voting opportunity to repeal the ACA, despite the fact that polls have repeatedly shown high satisfaction rates with the newly mandated coverage opportunities under Obamacare, even among Republicans.

My colleagues speaking against the ACA today are not listening to these polls, or to thousands of newly insured individuals in my 40th Congressional District who are thrilled with their new access to health care.

In my district and hundreds of other poor and minority communities across the country, the benefits of expanded coverage and provisions to address health disparities are already changing lives.

ACA opponents are not listening to women from all economic backgrounds who are no longer paying higher premiums because they are female, and who now have prenatal care as a covered benefit.

They are not listening to millions of seniors who love their free preventive services and lower prescription drug costs, or the disabled community that no longer has to live in fear of being denied coverage for pre-existing conditions or because they've reached lifetime limits.

Mr. Speaker, the ACA is working for my constituents, for women and minority communities, and for seniors and people with disabilities.

It is time for my Republican colleagues to listen to these Americans who DO NOT want to lose these health benefits.

This bill is the same misguided legislation Republicans forced through the House in

2011, 2012, and 2013. And like those bills, it has absolutely no chance of passing the Senate or being signed into law by the President.

Let's stop wasting Congressional time and taxpayer's money and find solutions to the other complex issues facing our nation such as creating jobs and strengthening our economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 596.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 70, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DESAULNIER. I am opposed in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DeSaulnier moves to recommit the bill H.R. 596 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING WOMEN, SENIORS, AND MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES FROM THE HARMFUL EFFECTS OF HEALTH REPEAL.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect unless and until such date that it is certified that such provisions will not result in—

(1) discrimination by health insurance issuers and group health plans on the basis of pre-existing conditions or gender, including in the form of higher premiums for women or loss of benefits such as mammograms, cervical cancer screenings, prenatal care, and commonly prescribed contraception;

(2) higher premiums or out-of-pocket costs for seniors for prescription drugs under prescription drug plans under the Medicare program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 et seq.); or

(3) a tax increase on middle class families through the loss of subsidies to purchase health insurance coverage.

Mrs. LOVE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the comments of my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I must say that it has not been my experience where I come from, but maybe it is a little different with my being from California.

This is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send

it back to committee. If adopted, the bill, as amended, will immediately proceed to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 596 would eliminate critical benefits and health care coverage from hardworking American families. In addition to taking away Americans' health care security, this bill would increase the deficit, make health care more expensive, and degrade the quality of care that patients are now receiving. If adopted, my motion to recommit would ensure that some of the most important protections of the Affordable Care Act would remain in effect.

Yesterday, as others have mentioned, was Groundhog Day, but, today, we are Bill Murray, living the same votes over and over again—in fact, as has been mentioned, 56 times over and over again.

This motion would protect existing law by continuing to, one, prevent insurance companies from discriminating based on preexisting conditions and gender or cutting health benefits for women; two, prevent increases in Medicare D prescription drug costs for seniors; and three, prevent a tax increase for middle class American families by the taking away of subsidies to purchase health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I am a former Republican and a small business owner who supports the Affordable Care Act and who has seen the benefits for small business. I have also seen the benefits for the economy and for the 7 million Californians who do not have health insurance. Many individuals who wanted health insurance were unable to obtain it, either because it was too expensive or because they had preexisting conditions, including nearly 126,000 people in my home county in the Bay Area.

One of these individuals in my district is a young woman named Emily. Emily was born with a congenital heart defect, and as a result, she will need regular monitoring and treatment by a cardiologist. Were it not for the Affordable Care Act, Emily would have been left without critical health care and the necessary treatment for the remainder of her young life.

Her situation is not unique. Approximately 130 million other Americans no longer have to worry about being denied health care coverage because of their health status. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, under the Affordable Care Act, almost 8 million seniors have saved nearly \$10 billion on prescription drugs, and under the Affordable Care Act, many people paid less for their insurance in 2014 than in 2013.

Before the law was enacted, health care premiums were increasing exponentially, much faster than college tuition, workers' wages, and inflation. Once the law took effect, premium increases for plans slowed down substantially. Simply, this law is saving Americans money. This year in California, with 2 weeks left to go in open enrollment, more than 273,000 Californians have joined the nearly 1 million cov-

ered California customers who were enrolled in 2014. Nearly nine of 10 enrollees received some kind of financial help in 2014, ensuring that Californians can afford the kind of coverage that they need and want.

Repealing the law without including these three protections will cost more than we can afford—\$100 billion over the next 10 years, until 2022, and more than \$1 trillion in the following decade. It would also discriminate against women in the form of higher premiums, and it would make it impossible for many women to get the care they need.

Mr. Speaker, every American family deserves a plan that covers essential health benefits, like hospital care, emergency care, care for pregnant women, and a plan that won't bankrupt them or this country just because an illness or an accident occurs. Every American family deserves to know that they won't be kicked off their insurance for a preexisting condition or be subjected to lifetime caps that take away their benefits when they need them the most.

Health care, Mr. Speaker, is not a Democrat or a Republican issue; it is an American issue and a human issue. We are here to ensure that every American continues to have access to quality, affordable health care. If we can produce a bill that fulfills the goals set out by the Affordable Care Act, it doesn't matter who wrote or signed the bill. But repealing the Affordable Care Act without including these important protections for hardworking, middle class American families is irresponsible and reckless.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1630

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a few questions of my colleagues as it relates to health care.

Has Congress made health care more accessible and affordable? Has the quality of care improved? No.

Do hardworking families and our children deserve better? Absolutely.

Now is the time to repeal and replace this disaster of a law. This law has hurt more poor and more middle-income families.

I received a letter from a constituent. Mr. Speaker, the letter states:

I wonder if you would like a real-life example of what ObamaCare is doing to families. My daughter and her husband are expecting their second child. They were planning on moving from their small apartment to a small home. Their insurance has doubled under ObamaCare, and they will pay \$500 a month. Their deductible will be \$10,000. They

will have to pay each doctor for a phone call plus \$50 copayment. No specialists are covered. They barely are getting by as it is. Because of their insurance costs, there is no chance of getting into a home or even a bigger apartment. How can insurance for everyone be of help if it causes such a financial burden on families? My daughter is so depressed. She isn't even excited about her upcoming child because she is so worried about their future. If we had the means to help, we would, but we don't. My heart breaks for her. How can Congress help?

Sincerely, Paula.

Now, people talk about tweaking ObamaCare. I ask: How do you tweak that to help that family?

The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker. Imagine a health care system that is centered in service. Imagine a health care system that is measured by outcomes, not by Washington dictates.

I know that it is hard for some of my colleagues to contemplate, but imagine, if you will, for me, Mr. Speaker, a health care system where dollars and decisions are left with patients, their families, and their doctor. I see an American exceptionalism at work, where families and innovation and compassion drive the highest quality of care.

Members of Congress, Representatives of the people, do not settle. Don't settle for just tweaking a bad program that hurts more than it helps, that controls more than it empowers. There are too many Members of this body that are content with just getting this health care law to be good enough. I am here to tell you that, for the American people, good enough just isn't good enough.

I reject the downward spiral of mediocrity and government takeover of health care. I refuse to pursue the administration's path of fear, blame, and failure. I oppose this motion to recommit a bad health care law.

It is time for us, for this body, to advance the policies and the principles which have lifted more people out of poverty, fueled more freedom, and driven more dreams than any other set of principles in the history of the world. I ask this body to come with me, boldly step forward and unleash that American exceptionalism that produces the health care solutions that this family is worthy of and every hardworking American in this country is worthy of.

May God continue to bless this great, exceptional country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair

will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 241, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—179

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| Adams | Gabbard | O'Rourke |
| Aguilar | Gallego | Pallone |
| Ashford | Garamendi | Pascarella |
| Bass | Graham | Payne |
| Beatty | Grayson | Pelosi |
| Becerra | Green, Al | Perlmutter |
| Bera | Green, Gene | Peters |
| Beyer | Grijalva | Peterson |
| Bishop (GA) | Hahn | Pingree |
| Blumenauer | Hastings | Pocan |
| Bonamici | Heck (WA) | Polis |
| Boyle (PA) | Higgins | Price (NC) |
| Brady (PA) | Himes | Quigley |
| Brown (FL) | Hinojosa | Rangel |
| Brownley (CA) | Honda | Rice (NY) |
| Bustos | Hoyer | Richmond |
| Butterfield | Israel | Roybal-Allard |
| Capps | Jackson Lee | Ruiz |
| Capuano | Jeffries | Ruppersberger |
| Cárdenas | Johnson (GA) | Rush |
| Carney | Johnson, E. B. | Ryan (OH) |
| Carson (IN) | Kaptur | Sánchez, Linda |
| Cartwright | Keating | T. |
| Castor (FL) | Kelly (IL) | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Castro (TX) | Kennedy | Sarbanes |
| Cicilline | Kildee | Jordan |
| Clark (MA) | Kilmer | Schakowsky |
| Clarke (NY) | Kind | Schiff |
| Clay | Kirkpatrick | Schrader |
| Cleaver | Kuster | Scott (VA) |
| Clyburn | Langevin | Scott, David |
| Cohen | Larsen (WA) | Serrano |
| Connolly | Larson (CT) | Sewell (AL) |
| Conyers | Lawrence | Sherman |
| Cooper | Levin | Sinema |
| Costa | Lewis | Sires |
| Courtney | Lieu (CA) | Slaughter |
| Crowley | Loebbeck | Smith (WA) |
| Cuellar | Lowenthal | Speier |
| Cummings | Lujan Grisham | Swalwell (CA) |
| Davis (CA) | (NM) | Takai |
| Davis, Danny | Luján, Ben Ray | Takano |
| DeFazio | (NM) | Thompson (CA) |
| DeGette | Lynch | Thompson (MS) |
| Delaney | Maloney, | Titus |
| DeLauro | Carolyn | Tonko |
| DelBene | Maloney, Sean | Torres |
| DeSaulnier | Matsui | Tsongas |
| Deutch | McCollum | Van Hollen |
| Dingell | McDermott | Vargas |
| Doggett | McGovern | Veasey |
| Doyle (PA) | McNerney | Vela |
| Edwards | Meeks | Velázquez |
| Ellison | Meng | Visclosky |
| Engel | Moore | Walz |
| Eshoo | Moulton | Wasserman |
| Esty | Murphy (FL) | Schultz |
| Farr | Nadler | Waters, Maxine |
| Fattah | Napolitano | Watson Coleman |
| Foster | Neal | Wilson (FL) |
| Frankel (FL) | Nolan | Yarmuth |
| Fudge | Norcross | |

NAYS—241

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Buck | Dent |
| Aderholt | Bucshon | DeSantis |
| Allen | Burgess | DesJarlais |
| Amash | Byrne | Diaz-Balart |
| Amodei | Calvert | Dold |
| Babin | Carter (GA) | Duffy |
| Barletta | Carter (TX) | Duncan (SC) |
| Barr | Chabot | Duncan (TN) |
| Barton | Chaffetz | Ellmers |
| Benishek | Clawson (FL) | Emmer |
| Bilirakis | Coffman | Farenthold |
| Bishop (MI) | Cole | Fincher |
| Bishop (UT) | Collins (GA) | Fitzpatrick |
| Black | Collins (NY) | Fleischmann |
| Blackburn | Comstock | Fleming |
| Blum | Conaway | Flores |
| Bost | Cook | Forbes |
| Boustany | Costello (PA) | Fortenberry |
| Brady (TX) | Cramer | Fox |
| Brat | Crawford | Franks (AZ) |
| Bridenstine | Crenshaw | Frelinghuysen |
| Brooks (AL) | Culberson | Garrett |
| Brooks (IN) | Curbelo (FL) | Gibbs |
| Buchanan | Davis, Rodney | Gibson |

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Gohmert | Luetkemeyer | Roskam |
| Goodlatte | Lummis | Ross |
| Gosar | MacArthur | Rothfus |
| Gowdy | Marchant | Rouzer |
| Granger | Marino | Royce |
| Graves (GA) | Massie | Russell |
| Graves (LA) | McCarthy | Ryan (WI) |
| Graves (MO) | McCaul | Salmon |
| Griffith | McClintock | Sanford |
| Grothman | McHenry | Scalise |
| Guinta | McKinley | Schock |
| Guthrie | McMorris | Schweikert |
| Hanna | Rodgers | Scott, Austin |
| Hardy | McSally | Sensenbrenner |
| Harper | Meadows | Sessions |
| Harris | Meehan | Shimkus |
| Hartzer | Messer | Shuster |
| Heck (NV) | Mica | Simpson |
| Hensarling | Miller (FL) | Smith (MO) |
| Herrera Beutler | Miller (MI) | Smith (NE) |
| Hice (GA) | Moolenaar | Smith (NJ) |
| Hill | Mooney (WV) | Smith (TX) |
| Holding | Mullin | Stefanik |
| Hudson | Mulvaney | Stewart |
| Huelskamp | Murphy (PA) | Stivers |
| Huizenga (MI) | Neugebauer | Thompson (PA) |
| Hultgren | Newhouse | Thornberry |
| Hunter | Noem | Tiberi |
| Hurd (TX) | Nugent | Tipton |
| Hurt (VA) | Nunes | Trott |
| Issa | Olson | Turner |
| Jenkins (KS) | Palazzo | Upton |
| Jenkins (WV) | Palmer | Valadao |
| Johnson (OH) | Paulsen | Wagner |
| Johnson, Sam | Pearce | Walberg |
| Jolly | Perry | Walden |
| Jones | Pittenger | Walker |
| Jordan | Pitts | Walorski |
| Joyce | Poe (TX) | Walters, Mimi |
| Katko | Poliquin | Weber (TX) |
| Kelly (PA) | Pompeo | Webster (FL) |
| King (IA) | Posey | Wenstrup |
| King (NY) | Price (GA) | Westerman |
| Kinzinger (IL) | Ratcliffe | Westmoreland |
| Kline | Reed | Whitfield |
| Knight | Reichert | Williams |
| Labrador | Renacci | Wilson (SC) |
| LaMalfa | Ribble | Wittman |
| Lamborn | Rice (SC) | Womack |
| Lance | Rigell | Woodall |
| Latta | Roby | Yoder |
| Lipinski | Rogers (AL) | Yoho |
| LoBiondo | Rogers (KY) | Young (IA) |
| Long | Rohrabacher | Young (IN) |
| Loudermilk | Rokita | Zeldin |
| Love | Rooney (FL) | Zinke |
| Lucas | Ros-Lehtinen | |

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1657

Messrs. GOSAR, BOST, COFFMAN, SALMON, LUETKEMEYER, ROYCE, and ROSKAM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 186, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

AYES—239

Abraham Griffith Paulsen
Aderholt Grothman Pearce
Allen Guinta Perry
Amash Guthrie Pittenger
Amodel Hanna Pitts
Babin Hardy Poe (TX)
Barletta Harper Pompeo
Barr Harris Posey
Barton Hartzler Price (GA)
Benishek Heck (NV)
Bilirakis Hensarling Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI) Herrera Beutler Reed
Bishop (UT) Hice (GA) Reichert
Black Hill Renacci
Blackburn Holding Ribble
Blum Hudson Rice (SC)
Bost Huelskamp Rigell
Boustany Huitzenga (MI) Roby
Brady (TX) Hultgren Rogers (AL)
Brat Hunter Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine Hurd (TX) Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL) Hurt (VA) Rokita
Brooks (IN) Issa Rooney (FL)
Buchanan Jenkins (KS) Ros-Lehtinen
Buck Jenkins (WV) Ross
Bucshon Johnson (OH) Rothfus
Burgess Johnson, Sam Rouzer
Byrne Jolly Royce
Calvert Jones Russell
Carter (GA) Jordan Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX) Joyce Salmon
Chabot Kelly (PA) Sanford
Chaffetz King (IA) Scalise
Clawson (FL) King (NY) Schock
Coffman Kinzinger (IL) Schweikert
Cole Kline Scott, Austin
Collins (GA) Knight Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY) Labrador Sessions
Comstock LaMalfa Shimkus
Conaway Lamborn Shuster
Cook Lance Simpson
Costello (PA) Latta Smith (MO)
Cramer LoBiondo Smith (NE)
Crawford Long Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw Loudermilk Smith (TX)
Culberson Love Stefanik
Curbelo (FL) Lucas Stewart
Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer Stivers
Denham Lummis Stutzman
Dent MacArthur Thompson (PA)
DeSantis Marchant Thornberry
DesJarlais Marino Tiberi
Diaz-Balart Massie Tipton
Duffy McCarthy Trott
Duncan (SC) McCaul Turner
Duncan (TN) McClintock Upton
Ellmers McHenry Valadao
Emmer McKinley Wagner
Farenthold McMorris Walberg
Fincher Rodgers Walden
Fitzpatrick MeSally Walker
Fleischmann Meadows Walorski
Fleming Meehan Walters, Mimi
Flores Messer Weber (TX)
Forbes Mica Webster (FL)
Fortenberry Miller (FL) Wenstrup
Foss Miller (MI) Westerman
Franks (AZ) Moolenaar Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen Mooney (WV) Whitfield
Garrett Mullin Williams
Gibbs Mulvaney Wilson (SC)
Gibson Murphy (PA) Wittman
Gohmert Neugebauer Womack
Goodlatte Newhouse Woodall
Gosar Noem Yoder
Gowdy Nugent Yoho
Granger Nunes Young (IA)
Graves (GA) Olson Young (IN)
Graves (LA) Palazzo Zeldin
Graves (MO) Palmer Zinke

NOES—186

Adams Brownley (CA) Clay
Aguilar Bustos Cleaver
Ashford Butterfield Clyburn
Bass Capps Cohen
Beatty Capuano Connolly
Becerra Cárdenas Conyers
Bera Carney Cooper
Beyer Carson (IN) Costa
Bishop (GA) Cartwright Courtney
Blumenauer Castor (FL) Crowley
Bonamici Castro (TX) Cuellar
Boyle (PA) Cicilline Cummings
Brady (PA) Clark (MA) Davis (CA)
Brown (FL) Clarke (NY) Davis, Danny

DeFazio Kind
DeGette Kirkpatrick
Delaney Kuster
DeLauro Langevin
DeBene Larsen (WA)
DeSaulnier Larson (CT)
Deutch Lawrence
Dingell Levin
Doggett Lewis
Dold Lieu (CA)
Doyle (PA) Lipinski
Edwards Loeb sack
Ellison Lowenthal
Engel Lowey
Eshoo Lujan Grisham
Esty (NM)
Farr Lujan, Ben Ray
Fattah (NM)
Foster Lynch
Frankel (FL) Maloney,
Fudge Carolyn
Gabbard Maloney, Sean
Gallego Matsui
Garamendi McCollum
Graham McDermott
Grayson McGovern
Green, Al McNerney
Green, Gene Meeks
Grijalva Meng
Hahn Moore
Hastings Moulton
Heck (WA) Murphy (FL)
Higgins Nadler
Himes Napolitano
Hinojosa Neal
Honda Nolan
Hoyer Norcross
Huffman O'Rourke
Israel Pallone
Jackson Lee Pascarell
Jeffries Payne
Johnson (GA) Pelosi
Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter
Kaptur Peters
Katko Peterson
Keating Pingree
Kelly (IL) Pocan
Kennedy Poliquin
Kildee Polis
Kilmer Price (NC)

NOT VOTING—8

Chu (CA) Lee
Duckworth Lofgren
Gutiérrez Nunnelee

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1705

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Wednesday, January 28, 2015 through Tuesday, February 3, 2015.

Had I been present on Wednesday, January 28, 2015, I would have voted "yea" on roll call vote 49, and "nay" on roll call vote 50 against final passage of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act.

Had I been present on Monday, February 2, 2015, I would have voted "yea" on roll call vote 51, "yea" on roll call vote 52, and "yea" on roll call vote 53.

On Tuesday, February 3, 2015 I would have voted "nay" on roll call vote 54, "nay" on roll call vote 55, and "nay" on roll call vote 56. I would have voted "yea" on roll call vote 57, and finally I would have voted "nay" on roll call vote 58 in strong opposition to H.R. 596, the 56th vote to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: Roll Call #57—Nay; Roll Call #58—Yea.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 203. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 77

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Welch and Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Perlmutter and Mr. Tonko.

(3) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Adams.

(4) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Walz and Mr. McNerney.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE HOUSE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the House Democracy Partnership:

Mr. ROSKAM, Illinois, Chairman
Mr. FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
Mr. BOUSTANY, Louisiana
Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
Mr. BUCHANAN, Florida

Mr. CRENSHAW, Florida
 Mrs. BROOKS, Indiana
 Mrs. BLACK, Tennessee
 Mr. RIBBLE, Wisconsin
 Mrs. WALORSKI, Indiana
 Mr. ZELDIN, New York

MIDDLE CLASS ECONOMICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, and Members, wow. There are actually people here in the audience and Members.

We have talked a lot about middle class economics, but why? Why is it important? Why did the President raise this issue in his State of the Union? What is this all about?

We are going to spend some time here today working our way through middle class economics, and some of my colleagues may join me, and I asked the Republicans, if they want to join, they could too.

It is okay, Madam Speaker, that they are not listening. But this is really an important issue.

So why is middle class economics important?

What is it all about?

It is really about driving the economy. If you want to create jobs in America, if you want to have economic growth in America, the middle class of America, the great middle class, the millions upon millions of men and women that are working families, they need to grow. And so middle class economics is all about growing the American economy, because that is where demand is created.

We often talk about the job creators, and businesses really create product and they create profit. But it is the middle class that actually creates the growth in the economy by creating the demand. So if we are able to grow the middle class, grow the paychecks, increase the vast number of Americans who are in the middle class, we will create the jobs. So that is why middle class economics is on our agenda.

□ 1715

There are other pieces of this. It leads to higher wages. So when you increase the middle class, you increase the higher wages, creating the demand.

So that is what this is all about. It is about opportunity. It is about growing the ability of the working families in America to make it, to have a shot at education, to have a shot at a home. So that is what we are going to talk about today in the next 46 minutes, about middle class economics. The President brought this issue to us. We are going to spend some time discussing this.

I notice that our fearless whip, STENY HOYER of Maryland, has joined us.

Mr. HOYER, please, let's get into this conversation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The reason I wanted him to yield is because I want to thank him. I don't know that there is any Member of this body or, frankly, the other body who has spent more time talking with the American public to let them know how focused we are on making sure that Americans can Make It In America. And the middle class, of course, is critically important.

I will tell the gentleman from California, he and I have both traveled outside this country—I think I have been to probably 60 nations—and every nation has its rich people, and every nation has its poor people. America's genius and success was posited, however, on the broad middle class that we had, that made America. They are the ones whose work and intellect and creativity and innovative spirit and entrepreneurial energy made America what it is and what it has been.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for the fidelity that he has shown over the years to this critically important objective of making sure that the middle class, working Americans have the ability to make it and to increase their standard of living over that of their parents. That has always been the genius of our country. It needs to continue to be. And the President, of course, has offered, as the gentleman points out, an agenda that is focused on working men and women in this country, making sure that they have the ability to live quality lives and have their children pursue education and do even better than their parents; and as they do so, their country, this great country of ours, will do better as well.

So I wanted to rise to thank the gentleman for his, as I say, fidelity to this objective, which is, after all, the critical agenda for our country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, Mr. HOYER. Nobody has been at this longer than you. You have been working in the Halls of Congress and across this Nation advocating for the middle class.

Both Democrats and Republicans now agree that the middle class in America has stalled out. They have not seen the increase in their paychecks. In fact, in the last couple of years, there has actually been a decrease on the average middle-American paycheck.

So what we are all about and what the President proposed to us in his State of the Union was middle class economics. And it is critically important, if we want to grow the jobs in this Nation, that we have got to pay attention to the middle class and how they can improve themselves, how they can have a higher standard of living, have greater paychecks. In doing so, we will grow this economy. We will be able to deal with the deficit. There are numerous ways in which this can be done.

We need to look for higher wages. Infrastructure is critically important. In the budget that the President just put

forth yesterday, there is a major advancement that he is proposing for infrastructure, a 6-year program, over \$600 billion in that 6-year period—\$673 billion building our roads, rebuilding our bridges, our ports, our communication systems. When you do that, you actually are going to grow the economy, and it is the middle class that will have those jobs.

So this is all about growing the middle class, otherwise known as middle class economics. That is what we are going to debate this year.

We are going to spend the next several months as we put together the budget first and then the appropriations and the various pieces of legislation—for example, reauthorizing the surface transportation program. We want to structure that. We, the Democrats, want to structure that in such a way that the principal benefits flow to the working families of America so that they can see greater wages, so that they can see greater opportunities. And there are many, many pieces to this puzzle that we need to pay attention to. So we want to grow American jobs.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) was here just a moment ago. And he has been talking about this theme of making it in America, which builds on the Buy America laws which have been in effect for more than 40 years. Our taxpayer money must be spent, should be spent on American-made equipment. We will come to this in a little more detail, but these are the fundamental parts of growing American jobs. You make things in America, whether that happens to be a movie or a new app for your iPhone or a train or a plane, whatever it happens to be. Make it in America; and use our taxpayer money to buy American-made equipment.

This one here: a well-educated workforce is fundamental to growing any economy, whether it be in Bangladesh or in the United States, the education of the workforce. If you have a well-educated workforce, your economy will grow.

America used to have the best education system in the world. We are not there anymore. We have fallen way off that power curve. We have got to establish America's position as having the best educated workforce in the entire world.

Now, the President, in his State of the Union and as part of the middle class economics, spoke to this issue when he talked about community colleges, all Americans being able to get 2 years of education at a community college, perhaps to pick up an AA degree or some skill set, and that it be free. What an important, important element that is in having a well-educated workforce. There are many, many other pieces to this educated workforce, and we will, over the next several weeks and months, be talking about this as we go forward.

Research and development. Well, I am from California, and I represent a

major research university, the University of California, Davis. You can just see spreading out from that university new businesses in biotechnology, biomedical, biopharmaceutical. We are seeing energy programs and new companies being created from the research at the universities. This is not just at Davis, California, but certainly Silicon Valley is a prime example of the skill being used all across this Nation, and other research institutions around the Nation. These are the ways in which you grow American jobs.

We talked earlier about infrastructure. We will come back to that.

Trade policies are also critically important. We will be debating the Trans-Pacific Partnership here and the TTIP, the European trade agreement. In those trade agreements, it is vitally important that we don't give away the American jobs. It will be a great debate. Very important. We have seen what happened with NAFTA and other trade agreements when we have simply allowed the offshoring of American jobs.

So these are six pieces of how you grow American jobs.

I notice my colleague from Vermont is here.

If you would care to join us in this conversation, I would be delighted.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you for doing this.

One of the things that we have to recognize in Congress is that policies really make a difference.

Wages have stagnated; people haven't had a raise in 15 or 20 years; and there are a lot of reasons for that. Some of it is globalization. A lot of it has to do with the weakening bargaining power of unions that were so helpful in improving living standards for everyday Americans, not just for the members of the union but for others who benefited by the commitment of unions to good jobs, good wages, and safe working conditions.

There are pressures with globalization that have reduced bargaining power. It has made things cheaper to buy but has really helped contribute to lower wages. The bottom line is that we need policies in order to focus attention, as you are saying, on the middle class and improving their purchasing power, giving them what the middle class has always had: a wage or a salary where, at the end of the month, they can pay their bills, set aside a little money for college, set aside a little money for a vacation, set aside a little extra money for retirement. That is a basic contract that we should be making.

We have got a variety of things where we have created policies and undercut the capacity of the middle class to sustain itself.

The tax policy is out of control. It is really outrageous when we have been passing these Bush tax cuts that are skewed very heavily toward high-end folks with the notion and the assertion that it will create jobs through trickle-down economics. It hasn't worked.

When we have entered, in some cases, into trade agreements, it didn't take into account the environmental and labor standards that are so essential to having a level playing field. American workers are willing to compete, but it has got to be on a level playing field.

Then basic things that a confident nation always invests in, even in tough times, like education and the future. We grew up, and those ahead of us had the GI Bill. They came back from serving their country and got a free education. But you know what? They paid it back, and then some, with their productivity.

We established Medicare and Social Security that has provided a safety net for older people. We are trying to make inroads now into providing a secure health care system for everybody through the Affordable Care Act, but we have a big challenge in bringing down those costs.

We have an opportunity to invest in, as you were saying, not just the higher education, but job training for people so that they have the skills that we need to compete in a modern economy.

And the infrastructure that you mentioned, how is it that in this country, where we have extraordinary engineers, extraordinary needs, and bipartisan agreement that we have to rebuild our roads and our bridges, extend broadband throughout the country, including in rural areas of Vermont and, by the way, rebuild our schools, rebuild our hospitals, all of these are institutions that are essential to the well-being of local communities that are where the middle-class people live, so I really appreciate your focus on this.

What is frustrating, I think, for America and for a lot of us in Congress is that our focus on policy is how many more tax cuts should we give to folks who don't need them, how much more should we spend on things that don't reward investment and hard work, and for how long are we going to continue this disinvestment in science, in research, in medical research, in infrastructure, and in education.

I am pretty amazed, as I know you are, that young people getting out of college, on average, have a \$30,000-plus debt. Many have accumulated debts in the range of \$100,000, and a lot of those debts are shared by their parents who have cosigned. They pay higher interest rates. A lot of those parents who have finally paid down their house and were looking forward to maybe taking a 2- or 3-week vacation, maybe a cruise, suddenly find themselves saddled, along with their kids, with these very high monthly payments for education.

So there is a bipartisan desire, I think, to help the middle class, but we are in a debate about what the solutions are. Essentially, one argument is that no taxes, no regulation, will somehow lift all boats. I don't think I have seen evidence that that is the case. Another argument is you have got to make sensible, prudent, disciplined de-

cisions about how and where to invest in the future of this country.

So, Mr. GARAMENDI, I salute you for your advocacy here and for speaking so eloquently on this issue that I think is the issue of our time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. WELCH, your representation of the State of Vermont is unparalleled. You have been at this for some time, and you have so correctly pointed out all of the various policies that are in law today that hold back the middle class.

You have talked about the tax policy that basically supports those at the very, very top—the one-percenters, the 10 percent—and forces, therefore, the tax burden onto the middle class and the poor. The President is suggesting a shift in that, and we are going to debate that here—and we should. But again, that is one more piece of this middle class economics to grow American jobs. These are all public policy issues, the Make It In America, the Buy America provisions, the education.

You raised something that has been very, very much on my mind. I have kids that have school debt from going to medical school or nursing school or even just to the 4 years, and I often wonder, the great majority of the student debt is actually owned by the Federal Government. I think about 60 percent of the \$1 trillion-plus in student debt is owned by the American public.

□ 1730

We refinance everything. We refinance our credit cards, and we refinance our home, seeking a lower interest rate. I just wonder: Why don't we refinance the student debt?

Mr. WELCH. That is exactly right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We could borrow money at less than 2 percent now for 10 years, probably 3 or 4 percent for 20 years. Why don't we go out and borrow at 2 percent, refinance that debt, and let them pay 2½ rather than 6, 7, 8, and 9 percent?

Mr. WELCH. If I may, Mr. GARAMENDI, you are so right. One of the upsides of this really tough economy is that interest rates have gone down, and a lot of folks have been given a little breathing room by being able to reduce their interest rates on their mortgage from 7 or 8 percent down to 3½ percent. That is real money in their pocket.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You bet.

Mr. WELCH. Why not allow students and parents who have cosigned on students loans that same opportunity to save a few bucks? They will pay those loans back.

So I salute you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Refinance your home; refinance your student debt. It is a bookkeeping procedure at the Federal level. Right now, those students are paying a very, very high interest rate to the U.S. Government, and they are held back. This is a major part of the middle class.

Mr. WELCH. Well, I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. WELCH, thank you for joining us.

Madam Speaker, I am going to carry on here for a few more moments. We are going to talk about a few other things that go into this. That previous placard had Make It In America as one of the principal ways of growing American jobs, and it is really true.

Madam Speaker, I want to give you just two examples of how Make It In America and Buy America creates American jobs—or not. Two bridges, one on the west coast, the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, and one on the east coast—New York, actually—the Tappan Zee Bridge in New York.

This bridge in the San Francisco Bay was supposed to be about a \$3 billion project. It turned out to be over \$6 billion. Instead of buying American steel, they went out and bought Chinese steel. It was supposed to be 10 percent cheaper. It turned out to be far, far more expensive. It became over budget.

It did create 3,000 jobs in China and serious problems with the quality of the steel, the welds, and other problems. Anyway, it wound up almost \$4 billion over budget, more than 100 percent more expensive. That was San Francisco. This is my State. This is a major controversy and, if you will, a major scandal in California.

In New York, the Tappan Zee Bridge is now under construction. It is 100 percent U.S.-made steel. It is coming in at about \$3.9 billion total, under budget, and there were 7,728 American jobs as a direct result of the decision made by New York to buy American, to make it in America.

This is the most clear example that I have been able to find—west coast, east coast—and the east coast is making the right decision of buying American, using the American taxpayer dollars in the case of both the commuters in New York or the commuters in San Francisco Bay, paying their money to China in the case of San Francisco Bay Bridge, or to American workers and American steel companies, a prime example of why Make It In America is so critically important because it is all about those middle class jobs.

It is about the steelworkers, the ironworkers, and the men and women that are doing the welding that are in the shops and in the steel mill harvesting or mining the coal and the iron ore to make the steel.

Keep this in mind, America: when we talk about Make It In America policies and when we talk about middle class economics, we are talking about bringing it home, keeping it home, and building our own economy.

China can do what they want to do, but let them do it with somebody else's money and not with American taxpayer money, so we are going to push this policy hard.

I want to give you another example, Madam Speaker, and that is that at this moment Amtrak—we know what Amtrak is. It is just the American passenger rail system. Amtrak is request-

ing a waiver from the Department of Transportation on the Buy America requirements for the purchase of 28 new high-speed rail train sets for the east coast corridor.

Amtrak correctly wants to make the trip between Washington, D.C., and Boston a whole lot faster. To do that, they want to transition to a whole new type of train—not the Acela, which was the last version of high speed. They want to go to a real high-speed system here on the east coast.

However, we are talking about tens of millions of dollars to be spent on these high-speed train sets, 28 of them. They want to waive the Buy America requirements—waive the Buy America requirements.

What happened with the Bay Bridge, the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge when they did that? The jobs went overseas. I am saying: No way, no how, are you going to waive the Buy America requirements. They say: Oh, but you don't understand. America doesn't make high-speed trains.

Yes, that is correct because we have never had them in the United States, and we never will if we waive the Buy America requirements both for the high-speed rail on the east coast or the high-speed rail on the west coast.

No way, no how, Madam Speaker, should we allow American taxpayer money to be spent overseas. Build it in America, make it in America, and hold on to those Buy America requirements. They are legal. They have been in law for nearly half a century. Keep them.

Amtrak, I am sorry, but I have talked to the companies that could manufacture these trains. They say: Of course we can make them in America. It is going to take a little while. We have got to build the factory. We can do it. If it is required, we will do it.

I will give you an example of how it actually happened. In the stimulus bill, the American Recovery Act, there was a provision, some \$700 million for Amtrak to purchase 100 percent American-made locomotives—these are the electric locomotives that will be operating on the east coast corridor, 100 percent American made, \$700 million, about 80 different trains, 80 different locomotives.

Siemens looked at that and said: Hmm, 700 million, that is a lot of money, 80, 90 trains or locomotives, we can do that.

They took their light-rail factory in Sacramento, California, about a mile from my district, a few miles from my home, expanded it, and began the process of making it in America. Those new locomotives are 100 percent American made by a German company operating in the United States.

Don't tell me you can't do it. Don't tell me that you cannot make aluminum frames for these trains, that you can't make wheels and brake systems in the United States. This is the United States. We used to be—and we must be—at the top of the pack. We can be if we bring it home, if we keep it home, and if we make it in America.

Remember. Remember this fiasco in California. Remember what happens when you went to China to buy steel, 100 percent over budget, and a lot of ongoing problems as to the safety of this bridge going forward.

Remember New York. They said they were going to buy American. It comes in under budget with 7,728 jobs in the United States, built by Americans. I am not proud of California in this situation.

Madam Speaker, there are a couple of other things that are on my mind. As I said, why middle class economics? It is about growing the demands. It is about rebuilding the middle class, giving the purchasing power to the middle class, and growing their wages.

Grow the paycheck. Grow the paycheck. Grow the jobs. Grow the paycheck. These are all ways in which we can raise the wage. There is this little #raisethewage, so when you see that out there on your Twitter account, you know what it is about. Grow the paycheck, buy American, education—job training and education.

This is a big one: more than 50 percent of the women in America are working, and they are working at the same job as a man for about 75 percent of the wage. Do you want to grow the wage? Do you want a bigger paycheck for American families?

Then pay attention to the law that has been in effect in the United States since John F. Kennedy signed it in the sixties, and that is equal pay for equal work.

This one down here at the bottom, the men and women at the bottom at the minimum wage. We have been calling for a raise in the minimum wage for months and years here.

If you want to help out the American economy, you raise the minimum wage—we excuse me, not you, us—Members of Congress and the Senate—raise the minimum wage, and we will see greater purchasing power and a growing economy as a result of that.

You don't lose jobs. The economic studies are clear. You are not going to lose jobs by raising the minimum wage. It hasn't happened in California. The minimum wage went up in California a year ago. We have seen job growth. We didn't see less jobs.

What we are seeing, Madam Speaker, is greater purchasing power by the families of America, fewer people on food stamps, and fewer people on welfare. As you raise the minimum wage, that is what happens, so this is what we call grow the paycheck, raise the wage.

I am going to let education go. We will pick that up later. I want to pick up one of my current challenges. I think anybody that studies American history will know that America was the greatest maritime nation in the world. We would contend with the United Kingdom—England—as to which was the greatest maritime nation, and we surpassed England.

We have lost that. We have seen our maritime industry—our mariners and

our ships—decline. We have very, very few ships flying the American flag anymore. All of the cruise ships that are advertised even on the Super Bowl 2 days ago were flagged overseas. They didn't have American crews on them, although all of their passengers seemed to be American—or at least many of them.

What we need to do is to find ways to rebuild the American maritime industry. These are the sailors, the merchant marines, the American mariners, the captains, the sailors, and the engineers.

It is also the shipbuilding. The great shipyards of America are in need of business. We do a lot of naval ships. Madam Speaker, this is a fundamental national security issue. The shipyards in America, the ability to build ships for the Navy and for our domestic trade is critical as a security issue. Obviously, it is critical as a jobs issue. We can do this.

We are in the process of exporting natural gas with liquefied natural gas. A new terminal by the Cheniere company in Texas will need 100 ships or more just for that one terminal. What I am saying is that if we are going to ship a strategic national asset—natural gas in the form of liquefied natural gas—if we are going to export that, then we ought to use that export to secure a second national security issue, and that is our merchant marines and our shipyards.

When this tanker, which happened to have been built in Japan, finds its way to an American port, will it be American sailors? This is a very dangerous thing. You are talking about millions of gallons of natural gas in liquefied form. Will it be American sailors? Will this ship be an American ship?

India wants to buy natural gas from the United States. They have a tender offer out. That tender offer says: We want to buy X gazillion cubic meters of natural gas—good—and three of the ships that transport that must be built in India.

□ 1745

And I say to India: Great. The other six or seven ships must be built in the United States. You want our gas, terrific. Then we want to have the ships built in the United States with American sailors.

This is a fundamental national security issue.

I just noticed that my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), came to join me on the floor, probably because I was praising New York so profusely with the Tappan Zee Bridge. Mr. TONKO, good for New York. Shame on California for building a bridge with Chinese steel.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from California for leading us on middle class economics and on infrastructure and on growing the jobs and growing the economy. That can be—must be—our top priority, making certain that the dignity of work and the

strength of drawing a paycheck are the American Dream that we want to help individuals and families across this country tether so they can move forward, utilizing their skills and talents and passions in order to be able to maintain a household, raise a family, and provide for the American Dream. It is always a pleasure to join you when we are speaking on these issues so forcefully, and to know there is a solution out there. There is a way to grow this economy, and looking at some of the items mentioned in the budget is important, and we should pay respect to that.

Certainly infrastructure that you just made mention of, and thank you for leading us in a recent motion to recommit to make certain that those who will staff those boats, transporting that cargo of LNG, create American jobs. We need to be very much disciplined in how we create a working agenda for America's families, and that is one step in the process.

But to the greater issue of infrastructure, I would suggest that we are well beyond that deadline when we should have responded to America's needs. We have a very deficient infrastructure. There are many bridges in this country that are rated deficient and weak. There are a number of situations with the grid system that was designed for a monopoly setting, and we now know that we transmit, we deliver electrons not only from region to region, former monopoly region to monopoly region, but State to State and country to country. It requires an upgrading in investment in our electric utility grid and certainly broadband. For our communication's sake, we need to wire neighborhoods in remote areas in communities across the country to enable us to strengthen the outcome, the commerce end of it all, to give businesses those needs that are so important.

Let me just close with this, because I see our friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has joined us. I believe it is the Ninth District of Ohio.

I recently held a press conference at home after a week of being on the floor here, and it was about the child care and dependent child care credit, tax credit, and it was amazing to hear the real-life stories of parents who struggle, trying to work. They need two incomes and are impacted by the high cost of child care, quality child care. They need that comfort zone to know that as a coparent, in a way, with the given agency that they are in a secure setting, so that they can be productive at work and know that their children are well cared for.

And it brings great benefits. There are social and cognitive and educational skill sets that are introduced into the lives of those toddlers and children that makes them all the more ready for that pre-K to K to elementary setting, so it has great benefits. But when you think about the fact that the average cost is \$10,000 per year for child care, and when toddlers can be as

high as \$16,000 and a 5-year old as high as \$12,000 per year, that is an immense cost to families.

So as the President addresses this issue in the budget, he triples that benefit to some \$3,000 per child under 5 per family. For families making as much as \$120,000, they can get that full benefit, and there is a scaled-down benefit for family incomes as high as \$210,000.

So there are efforts here to grow the economy through middle class economics. The middle class has taken it on the chin for far too long. We have seen the growth of this economy post-recession and all of the added wealth that has come since that turnaround, that upward movement that has gone to a relative few in our society. Now it is time to share the wealth with the great numbers of us in the middle class, and that is the engine that runs America.

If you give more purchasing power to the middle-income community, you give it to the working poor, give it to those looking to ascend into the middle class, that will drive a strong economic recovery, even more powerful than what we have seen since the President took office in 2009, when we hit the lowest point in March 2009. From that recession that President Obama inherited, we have done really well. We could have done much better with infrastructure investments, which would have put many people in the trades to work and where we would have responded with a much stronger outcome for purchasing power for the great many of us in that middle-income community.

So, Mr. GARAMENDI, it is always a pleasure to join with you and our colleagues to make certain that we bring to the public's attention direct assistance that we can provide, items that have been introduced in bill format or included in a proposed budget from the President that can make a difference in the fabric of this community called America, where we can tether that American Dream in more noble and measured terms, and where we can make certain that we not only grow the climate for job production but grow the economy.

So it is within our grasp, but we just have to be bold in our attempt to go forward and to be progressive in our thinking and in our policies.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, you have been here on the floor with me many times over the last few years, and we keep beating this drum about American jobs. We now have a policy from the President, middle class economics, that has all of the elements, many of which we have talked about on the floor—the research issue, the education issue, the job training issue, the infrastructure, all of those things—and it is all pulled together in middle class economics.

Another piece of that puzzle is trade policy. If we are going to grow American jobs, as I put this up before—Make

It In America, Buy American, education workforce, research, infrastructure, and then this one down here, trade policy.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has spoken to us on the floor about this issue many times. She is passionate about it. I think she is right about it. We have to be really, really careful as to how we do our international trade programs so that we don't hollow out the great American manufacturing sector, American jobs, whether they are in agriculture or manufacturing, or in other parts of our economy.

Ms. KAPTUR, we would love to hear from you on this issue. I know that you are passionate about it and very well informed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for bringing us together again. He is truly a leader on growing American jobs, all of the way from California, way out on the west coast, to the gentleman from New York's community on the east coast. I commend both of you for your dogged determination to keep expanding the recovery and doing everything we can to help the American people have increasing paychecks and fulfilling work and a good family life where they are able to raise their children and fulfill their dreams, whatever they might be.

I just wanted to come to the floor and talk about America's trade policies for a brief moment and the records. Statistics don't lie, and our trade policies have been costing us more jobs than they have been yielding us for a very long time. The trade policies that have been enacted have actually caused the United States to cumulate since 1976 a staggering number—\$9.5 trillion—in trade deficits. That means more imports coming in than our exports going out. Translating that into lost jobs, foregone jobs, 47.5 million lost jobs in that little over a quarter century.

The American people say: Why do we have a budget deficit?

Well, I will tell you why. When you lose this much productive wealth inside your country to other places, our people start to backslide, and they have been backsliding since the 1980s. Despite our hard work here to try to make a difference, trade policies have an enormous impact on the ability of the American people to maintain a standard of living and to both remain in the middle class or aspire to it and earn their way forward.

It now takes two in a family to earn enough, whereas when I grew up, our father worked and that was enough to support our family—until he became ill, and that is a whole other story. But today, it is so hard for people to have two people working in the family and hold their household together. They are scrimping every week as to where they are going to put their limited incomes.

I just wanted to put this so people start thinking: How did America get in

this deep a hole on trade? I believe before we sign any more trade agreements, we ought to go back and fix what is wrong with the current ones. Wouldn't that makes sense?

They promised us with Korea, which is one of the most recent agreements, that we would be exporting 50,000 automobiles over there. It hasn't happened. In fact we have already lost 17,000 additional jobs because of the Korean agreement not being in balance.

So I think we have to be rigorous and ask ourselves: How do we fix this for the sake of the future, not just this generation but the next? I have a long list, and I am going to be coming to the floor many evenings going through this list, talking about companies that we have known in this country and where they have relocated. I know that the workers in those places and the executives who used to run those companies, I know how hard they worked to create great American products, and they didn't deserve the fate they were dealt because of bad trade policies.

Let's look at Huffy Bicycle in Celina, Ohio. Huffy Bicycle used to be known coast to coast. It was made in western Ohio, and it actually became and is currently a Wal-Mart supplier. Unfortunately, well over 1,000 people lost their jobs at Huffy Bicycle in Ohio in the late 1990s—1998—and the plant first moved from Ohio to Missouri, and then it moved from Missouri to Mexico, and then it made its final move from Mexico to China.

So if you look at Huffy Bicycle today, you will see the paint job is not the same. You will see the tires aren't the same. The quality of the metal is not the same. It is not the bicycle that used to be made in Ohio that lasted a lifetime.

So there has been a knockdown, a decrease in quality, that has come with that manufactured product, which is then shipped back here to the United States and sold in different locations. It is kind of sad, really, what happens.

I love chocolate. I used to really like to buy Hershey bars, and I still eat Hershey. But Hershey had always been manufactured in Pennsylvania—in Hershey, Pennsylvania. In fact, when you walked through Hershey, you could smell the chocolate in the streets. It was just absolutely captivating. But if you have noticed, Hershey has changed. The recipe has changed. They will deny it, but a large part of their production was moved to Mexico. They even had to change the wrapper to withstand the warmer temperatures, and the recipe changed, and all of those workers in Hershey, Pennsylvania, in 2011. That happened in 2011. These are brand-name products that we know in our country.

Dell—Dell had been located in the Carolinas, and in 2009 they moved to Mexico, too. So you think about the manufactured products that we have known, and companies like Bank of America that had offices in Cincinnati, Ohio, and Independence, Ohio, they

moved production to Mexico too, in 2013. So if people think they are safe in their service job because they are not in manufacturing, they will be very surprised to learn that the service jobs will follow.

How many phone calls have you gotten in your home from a call center located in—and it could be anywhere in the world but here. And I always ask the person from the call center:

Where are you calling from and how much do you earn?

I find that their earnings are so low they can't buy the very product that they are selling over the telephone. What kind of world are we creating?

The markets that exist in other places like Korea, Japan, and China are closed to us. We are racking up these gigantic trade deficits because we can't get our products in there, and the people in those places don't earn enough money to buy some of what we export. So it is really a rather vicious cycle. I am not going to take up much more time except to say that I believe where America went wrong was about 30 years ago.

□ 1800

We should have signed a trade relationship with Europe which shares our political and legal values. They subscribe to a rule of law: "We can do business." Though their markets aren't completely open, they are pretty open, and we could work with them.

Then we should have invited into that structure, which starts with a belief in democracy and representative government, these other countries that are aspiring to be better than they are, but without the political advancement, their economic system will never work for them without the rights the American people have.

We could have invited in Mexico. We could have invited in the CAFTA countries. We could have invited in Korea, et cetera, to that union of democracy-loving republics. We didn't do that.

What worries me over time is, in the end, we might be cashing out our very liberty because, if you look globally at what is happening, you will find in those places that the people are not treated well that are doing this work. Over time, what kind of residue does that leave toward our country and toward those who are their new overlords?

I have walked through some of these places; I have walked through some of these companies. I remember walking through with our mother—God love her—when she was still living, through one company in Mexico.

She said, "MARCY, look at the women's faces," and I did. They were so afraid. They were afraid of their boss. They were afraid of us. They were afraid of losing their work because there was no worker representation. What kind of a world are we contributing to in these other places that most Americans will never visit?

I thank the gentleman. As I see your title there, "Grow American Jobs," I

would say, "Grow American democracy. Grow representative government at the same time as we do trade."

I think we really got way out of kilter back in the 1980s when these agreements began to be imbued with the kind of power they had.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. KAPTUR, you are very, very correct about the role of trade policy and hollowing out the American jobs in almost every sector—you mentioned several sectors—and in every one of those, we have seen this happen.

We are going to be engaging in a debate this year about whether we are going to extend trade policies to what is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership and, also, very, very soon, whether we will give away our constitutional obligation to write trade policy, whether we are going to give that away to the administration.

For me, this is extremely important. We have seen this year after year, we have seen this problem, and I do not want to see a repeat of it in the new legislation.

I would like to just move to a couple of other issues. We have got about 7 minutes left. Perhaps, Mr. TONKO, if you would take a few of those minutes and wrap up, keeping in mind that this is all in the context of middle class economics, how the American family that is struggling to make it in America, how they can do better with a set of policies that we are proposing to the American public—tax policy, infrastructure, educational policy, research—all of these things that are part and parcel of middle class economics.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

If I could just associate my comments with the representative from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR talked about the impoverishment factor around the world. These negotiated agreements are much more than just trade barriers and tariffs. They become public policy.

When you lose American jobs, that is only the beginning of the story. We have made a situation very critically tough here, and we have resulted in impoverishing workers around the world, so that is an undoable, unsustainable outcome.

I think back when Ms. KAPTUR spoke of the exodus of jobs and the incremental steps that took them eventually offshore. I think of the entire passageway of the Erie Canal system that drove a westward movement, reached Ohio, and then eventually allowed for the development to the west coast.

You think of that, and many a person, many a worker, tethered the American Dream to those mill towns that were given birth to by that Erie Canal system. That was the empowerment of this Nation—and to think that that whole history has been rejected. A lot of the creative genius came from the immigrant who was working on those assembly lines. We need to remember that history. We must have it speak to us.

This whole idea of inserting public policy into these agreements or, again, circumventing our responsibilities here in the House—people who we represent at home need to ask us: Where are we on fast track? Do we want to give up that congressional responsibility and just do thumbs up or thumbs down on a negotiated agreement?

The other items that I am concerned about are items like the earned income tax credit. That is part of the budget request made by the President. I spoke to a number of people in my district who rely on that and others who aren't even filing for the earned income tax credit and they qualify.

I want people to understand that this is not a tax loophole, this is economic and social justice, where we take folks who perhaps might not even make enough to file a tax return to get an earned income tax credit.

This is one of the greatest anti-poverty agents we have in the budget, so we need to make certain that that earned income tax credit is available when the final budget is completed, and we need to make certain we get the word out.

This is about empowering those who are at the lower strata of income. We want to make certain that programs like the earned income tax credit speak to those who are working. It is encouraging people to work, and it is trying to bring again some economic justice and social justice.

So many of these communities are benefited when we remind people that these tax opportunities are available for them. It empowers the regional economy. So many times, there is poverty clustered in some of our urban cores, and so the social justice that comes with an earned income tax credit is that millions of dollars are now brought back into the community.

On those budgets where our lower strata income qualifying folks are, they are going to spend those dollars, they are not going to bank those dollars. So an earned income tax credit, dependent child care tax credit, these are important items—fair trade, infrastructure improvement, there are a great number of things that we can do to muscle up the outcome here.

It begins in those hallowed halls of government where you can, through these efforts in the halls of government, make policy happen. We need to take heed as to what needs to be done for our middle income community.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, I thank you so very, very much.

Ms. KAPTUR, we are in what we call the rapid fire. You have about 2 minutes, then I will wrap it up with another minute, and we are out of time. If you would, please.

Ms. KAPTUR. I appreciate your focus on growing the middle class and helping those who aspire to be in it to be successful in that journey. There is no question that when you have a robust middle class, it creates the demand that then buys the products from the

corporations across this country that want to earn dividends, so that they can share those with their shareholders.

Growing the middle class drives our economy and it creates the jobs, and the people who do those jobs really create the company, they make the company work.

It isn't the shareholders who are down there on the lines, although I believe very much in shareholder equity for workers. I wish I could encourage more of it. Wouldn't that be great if they could all have a part of the indexes that the wealthy invest in? Because they certainly have earned it.

Through good jobs with decent wages, through the transportation and infrastructure bill I hope we can pass this year, which would be one action we could take that would help to give a big boost to this economy from coast to coast, all of that can help lift people's boats across this Nation.

I join in alliance with my two dear colleagues, Congressman TONKO and Congressman GARAMENDI, who are down here all the time. You are such good Representatives from your respective States, fighting on behalf of the American people.

Most of the rest of the place has gone home, but you are on the job. You remind me of members of my family. They always worked overtime.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I want to thank you and Mr. TONKO for joining us, so I have got Ohio and New York. Mr. HOYER was here earlier from Maryland and Mr. WELCH from Vermont. We covered a large part of the United States.

We are all talking about what the President has put forth as a national policy of middle class economics: how we can grow the American economy, why it is so important for the middle class to really succeed, because that creates demand that then America businesses can fulfill in their many, many ways.

I notice that the esteemed chairman of the Rules Committee is here, and I suspect he wants to present us with some information. Mr. SESSIONS, if you are ready—and I will continue on until you are ready.

In the meantime, the elements of the middle class economics, we know why it is important. It builds the demand that the businesses can then fulfill—American business—and so you really create the jobs with that demand.

It also gives us higher wages. You are strengthening the middle class with higher wages.

We talk about infrastructure. We will spend a lot of time talking about infrastructure as we come up to the May deadline where we must renew the infrastructure law, the surface highway transportation.

All of these are pieces of the puzzle. We are nearly out of time, but I see the esteemed chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman very much, my fellow Eagle Scout from California.

In fact, I did walk on the floor here, and I noticed that Ms. KAPTUR is here, Mr. TONKO is here, and you are having a vigorous discussion which is important with the American people.

I am about to be in receipt of a bill that will come down that will be presented to the floor here in just a minute, so if I keep talking here for just a minute.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I may interrupt here for a second?

Thank you for the courtesy that you provided to me in the Rules Committee when the liquefied natural gas—the LNG bill came up and when we talked about how we could use that strategic asset to enhance another strategic asset, the American shipbuilding industry. You were kind.

We had a wonderful discussion in the committee and then again on the floor. It is another way in which we can grow the American economy, by using public policy in this way, and there are many, many other pieces to it.

I think your staff has just arrived with the papers that you need, so I will yield to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would, pending receiving those, which is just about to happen, say to the gentleman that his ideas that he brought to the Rules Committee, in fact, were received well, the ideas about shipping in American ships, building of American ships, the opportunity for American ships to employ people as they transported American products around the world.

We will be ready here in half a second, so anybody who is watching gets high drama.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have always looked forward to a dialogue, a bipartisan dialogue, on important issues, and I didn't quite know that we would come to that at this moment while we await your staff bringing down their papers.

In the meantime, I thank my colleagues very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 527, SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-14) on the resolution (H. Res. 78) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE EFFECTS OF THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I do appreciate my friend's discussion today. In fact, there is an article I would like to move right into regarding the President's proposal to help middle America by going after corporations.

□ 1815

This is an article of Money News from Newsmax, by Peter Morici. This points out:

Posturing as champion of needed public investments and fairness, President Barack Obama wants new taxes on the overseas earnings of American businesses. That would kill jobs and punish retired Americans. Although special deals permit some corporations to pay low taxes, most pay a heavy burden. The estimated effective U.S. corporate tax rate is about 27 percent and is well above the 20 percent imposed by other industrialized countries.

The United States is virtually alone by taxing the overseas profits of its multinationals when those are repatriated. This has encouraged U.S. firms to invest nearly \$2.1 trillion of their earnings abroad instead of bringing some of that money home to create jobs in America. Now the President wants an immediate 14 percent tax levy on those assets to raise about \$500 billion and to impose a 19 percent tax on future earnings to finance infrastructure investments.

Madam Speaker, we have heard this before, this mantra about how we are going to build infrastructure. If you will just give us, as it was the last time, \$900 billion, we are going to rebuild the infrastructure of America.

What happened?

We got Solyndra, and some Democratic friends got lots and lots of money and grants and all kinds of benefits, and we didn't get the infrastructure we were promised. Every time the President wants to trot out a new program, he throws that in because it worked. Seriously, it worked 6 years ago. Americans bought into it, and the majority here bought into it. Let's give him the money so we can build infrastructure, and we saw that that was a word that was not kept.

There is the point that many have made about the President's new proposals that he brought up in the State of the Union Address to help the middle class, to help the Nation's poor, and we have seen how the middle class has been helped under this President—the middle class has gotten smaller. The gap between the ultra rich and the poor has gotten wider, and we have more poor. We have got more people on food stamps than ever in history, more than anybody could have ever imagined when that program was started, and it continues to be a massive problem for much of America.

There is trouble getting a job. Oh, I know we keep being told that the Cook

numbers work well. Gee, the economy is doing so well. But across America, people understand "I am not doing well." If they have been able to keep their jobs, they have not seen their wages keep up like they should have. At the same time, the administration is trying to convince the middle class and the Nation's poor: "I am taking care of you."

What is actually happening behind the scenes?

We know for at least the first 5, 6 years of this administration and for the first time in our Nation's history, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent. Before this administration, the Obama administration, that had never, ever happened.

It is tragic when you see the effect that it has on families. It is tragic when you see that people had such hope for this President's helping the poor, not adding to the poor. They had hope for climbing up through the middle class and maybe, one day, having a shot at being wealthy. Unless you are a President or a former President, it is kind of tough to make that kind of move because not everybody gets paid a million bucks or even \$100,000 for giving a speech. So most of America that was suffering before is still suffering. In many cases, it is much worse.

The people who really understand money management are pointing out: wait a minute. If you break down what the President is proposing in order to help, supposedly, the middle class, and if he is going to tax these evil corporations on money they have earned overseas when they have a corporate presence here and there, some of us have been proposing: if you will just eliminate any penalty, then they will bring that money into the United States; they will use that capital here in the United States; jobs will be created, and plants will be expanded; and there will be more people able to join unions of non-government working people because those are the kinds of jobs that would come back. If you lowered the tax on corporations down to where China has it, you would see companies come flooding back into the United States that built their plants in China.

As our good friend Arthur Laffer has pointed out, the rich are the people you are not really able to tax because they will move on you. They will move, and they will change the way they make income. I know people like Democrat Warren Buffett like to say: "Oh, gee. I am willing to pay more taxes." It is one thing to say it. It is another to write the check, and that hasn't happened. If he wanted to pay the same income tax rate that his secretary pays, then he could pay that. Write the check. You don't have to keep it all. It is okay. You can send it to the government if you want to. Unfortunately, when you tax corporations as much as we do in the United States, and when that tax gets passed on to the consumers—because, if it doesn't, they don't stay in business—then it is back to the middle class paying those taxes.

If you start taxing these multinational corporations for money they have earned in another country and they have paid taxes on in another country—and if you are going to tax it to bring it into the United States—then they are not going to bring it in. If you are going to tax them for even having a presence here, then you will find the presence will go. The jobs that are here in the United States will go. You are going to have trouble ever taxing the multinational corporations, like the richest people in the world, because they will move. They will change the way they do business to avoid that tax. It is the middle class and those amongst the poor who actually pay tax—income tax, that is—who end up taking the biggest hit.

If you want to make taxes fair, let's go to a flat tax across the board. If you make more, you pay more. If you make less, you pay less. I like a deduction for the home mortgage interest, and I like charitable deductions. But, otherwise, let's just drop all of them. If you make more, you pay more. That would be fair.

Instead, if you want to look around to what has really done massive damage to the ability of the middle class and the Nation's poor, particularly African Americans, there has been a tremendous problem getting employed, staying employed, and having higher wages because this administration keeps bringing in people, giving them work permits—people who have come in illegally. Now we know that the big corporations are even given a \$3,000 bonus if they will hire someone who came here illegally, one of the 5 million.

Now, Texas has created most of the jobs that the President stood right here and took credit for. It was rather interesting. I know people in this administration like to make jokes about Texas, but it would have been nice if, when he took credit for creating jobs, that he would have thanked Texas for being the place that really bailed him out and kept him from having to stand up and report a net loss of jobs. So we are glad to help out, not because we are helping the President but because we are helping real people in America.

If he really wants to help the Nation's poor, the working poor, those few who are left in the middle class, he would quit giving people who have come in illegally work permits, which actually incentivizes more people to come in illegally, and then there wouldn't be any need for him to come in and say we have got to raise the minimum wage, because we know—there is no question—when you raise the minimum wage, people who are trying to break into the working of America don't have jobs. People lose their jobs.

For businesses that are barely getting by at a profit, when you force a higher minimum wage, then those people who are brought in at the entry level naturally don't produce as much

as people who have been there a while because it takes a learning curve. But the minimum wage is the entry level if it is even at minimum wage. Most businesses I talk to around east Texas will pay more than the minimum wage even for startup employment. But once you raise the minimum wage, they are going to have to lay somebody off, and somebody is going to have to work harder because they cannot afford, like the government, to be operating in the red—they would go broke—because they don't get to print their own money and create their own monetary system.

I see here another article today. This is from Neil Munro of The Daily Caller: "Obama Quietly Adds 5.46 Million Foreigners to Economy."

That should be great news for the economy, but since there haven't been 5.46 million jobs created in this administration, that means that they are going to take over jobs and that Americans who emigrated legally are going to lose their jobs. When you tack on that you get a \$3,000 bonus under ObamaCare if you hire somebody who came illegally and got one of these work permits—they are not required to have ObamaCare, and so they don't have to provide health insurance; therefore, the companies don't have to pay the \$3,000 penalty—it gives incentives to hire people who came illegally and got the work permits.

Now, we had before our Judiciary Committee today some witnesses, and I greatly appreciated Chairman GOODLATTE for calling the hearing. It was very enlightening. We had a sheriff, a law professor, a couple of people who work on the immigration issue. I didn't realize until the testimony that, when released, about 50 percent of those people who have come here illegally and who have committed a crime commit another crime. I had somebody else explain it to me after the hearing.

If you come here and if you have no respect for the law in the United States, is it any mystery that you are going to be more likely to disregard the criminal laws as you have the immigration laws? Fortunately, everybody doesn't see it that way who emigrates here illegally, but it is a problem.

□ 1830

If you are a 21-year-old store clerk that is just trying to make it, you are not making that much money, but you are trying to make it, you are working tough hours in a thankless job, and unbeknownst to you as a 21-year-old store clerk, the Obama administration—Homeland Security has followed the lead of the President. They have not been deporting people that came illegally, committed crimes, like they should be. So unknown to you, the 21-year-old store clerk, that man who has committed crimes before and has not been deported because this administration is not following up to the oath that was taken, you are about to have

your life taken away from you by someone that should not even be in the country.

I was with another Member of Congress today when staff came and notified him that one of their staff had been hit by another car. It was the fault of the other car, and the people in the other car got out, walked around, and then by the time the officer got there, they complained one of their group couldn't walk, couldn't use their legs. So here comes the ambulance. Who knows. Maybe they have figured out our system well enough to know you just file a lawsuit even though you were at fault for the wreck, file a claim against the insurance company.

But there are people who are here in this country illegally who would like to be here legally, and we ought to help and encourage them to do just that: Come legally; follow the law; make application.

There are those of us whose offices help those who come legally. We have been helping people who have immigrated legally to try to get their spouse into the country, and we find out that actually this administration, by the executive amnesties and decrees, has apparently used the fees that were paid by people who came legally, trying to bring in others legally, trying to do everything right, some paid a higher fee to try to speed up the time with which they could get their spouse or loved one in the country, and with the stroke of the pen this President apparently put those on hold, said: We are going to take those fees that people who were acting legally and within the law paid to get their loved one in, we are going to put their applications on hold because I have got a whole bunch of people over here who entered illegally that I want to come in. I am sure they will vote Democrat when they get the chance, but I need them beholden to the Federal Government, so we are going to bring in these people that didn't believe in following the law, give them amnesty and a work permit, allow a \$3,000 bonus under ObamaCare to businesses that hire them, get rid of their American workers, their legal immigrants, and hire people that came in illegally.

The question arises, and it is a very important question because it has criminal consequences, if anyone within the United States Government, executive branch particularly, takes money that was ordered for one purpose under the law and converts that money's use to another without getting the permission of Congress, without jumping through the hoops that are required to use that money for another purpose and use it for a purpose such as getting a lease in Crystal City so that you can set up your amnesty mill, you have got a problem, and so do we because you may have violated the law, and it may be a crime.

I am hopeful that we are at the early stages of getting to the bottom of that so we can find out whether somebody

broke the law. We know that there are criminal statutes regarding government workers if they use their position, particularly at the IRS, and yet Lois Lerner basically got caught red-handed, took the Fifth Amendment. Even still, the President, the executive branch didn't want to get rid of her, so paid her to stay home for a while. But nobody has been prosecuted, nobody has been pursued out of those laws that were broken in the Internal Revenue Service to go after conservative groups.

No question. We don't know the full extent, but no question, it had to have helped the President in the election of 2012. All you have got to do is keep your opponents from being able to form groups like the Democrats have. Of course, a lot of the Democrats' funding comes from government money that goes through unions and ends up helping Democrats, but these are groups that were raising their own money that they had earned. It wasn't money received from the government. People who actually did build that, they did earn that, and they were wanting to pool their money for political purposes, but the IRS put them on hold for long enough, some of them for years, so that they could not play any role in the 2012 election.

This administration was able to use the laws or the Tax Code and use the IRS in ways Richard Nixon could have only dreamed of. He had an enemies list, but he was not able to carry out the vendetta like some in the IRS appear to have done. So that is here in this country as people are suffering, workers struggling, especially African American minority workers, their unemployment rate so dramatically higher.

I have had people ask me—and I am not really sure of the answer—if President Obama actually should get all the credit for the jobs that have been created in the United States, then why in the world was he creating them all in Texas, most of them in Texas? That just seems a little strange. But I would think his supporters would certainly fall away from supporting someone in the Democratic Party that creates jobs mainly in a very red State. But if that is true and he gets the credit for creating all the jobs in Texas, over a million, then he is to be congratulated on the bipartisan nature of that effort, although the Senate would wonder whether or not he actually participated in that.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to one of the more horrendous acts that man has inflicted on man. The Islamic State—and that first word is "Islamic"—released a video that shows, or purports to show, Jordanian pilot al-Kaseasbeh prior to being burned alive. The video released today appears to show him being burned alive.

Some say: How could they do such a thing? It seems to me that if one human being can take a dull knife and

jaggedly cut off the head of another human being, he is probably pretty capable of burning another human being alive.

There is evil in this world. Adolf Hitler manifested pure evil. It is the only way he could have been responsible for the mass killings of 6 million Jews in Europe.

It is unbelievable, but when the United States fails to lead, fails to point out the horrors and the ideology behind it and goes to war against those who invoke this kind of evil and push it and use it against human beings, at a time when the United States is called the lone superpower, then the vacuum in the world of power is filled by the most evil among us, and that is what is happening.

It is unbelievable, and yet this is who these radical Islamists are. One story after another in the news about that pilot being burned alive, and yet we come to the story of the President addressing this today, this one entitled, "Obama Comments on Jordanian Pilot Burned Alive, Doesn't Know What 'Ideology' Islamic State Follows." The President is quoted as saying:

I just got word of the video that had been released. Should in fact this video be authentic, it is just one more indication of the viciousness and barbarity of this organization.

He wouldn't even call the organization the Islamic State, which is what they call themselves. The President says:

It, I think, will redouble the vigilance and determination on the part of a global coalition to make sure that they are degraded and ultimately defeated.

It is interesting. The President doesn't say we are going to defeat this radical ideology, this Islamic State, we will defeat them, we will stop them. It brings to mind the response of Winston Churchill. He was making sure everyone knew that Britain was not going to let evil win, that they were going to fight them on the beaches, fight them on the land, fight them in the air, fight them wherever they found them.

Our leader in this current world crisis here in the United States, the position some say is the most powerful leader's position in the world, says:

And it, I think, will redouble the vigilance and determination on the part of the global coalition to make sure that they are degraded and ultimately defeated.

But it doesn't stop there. Our President goes on to say:

It also indicates the degree to which whatever ideology they are operating off of, it is bankrupt.

"Whatever ideology they are operating off of"? It is called the Islamic State.

I have seen amazing prosecutors at work trying to pull together a case. I have seen incredible law enforcement minds at work as they try to put together pieces of the puzzle to figure out some law enforcement mystery, figure out the source of some crime. But I don't think it would take the more brilliant law enforcement officers in

our country—so many that I have met and come to appreciate their intellect. I don't think it takes them to figure out what ideology they are out of, because the first piece of the puzzle when we are looking to determine what ideology these evil men are working out of, let's see, what do they call themselves?

□ 1845

We will start with that clue. They call themselves the Islamic State. Well, that would seem to indicate that perhaps the ideology they are out of would be an Islamic ideology. Since these people get real upset if anybody draws a cartoon—for example, about the prophet Muhammad, as they call him—then perhaps it is that people that hold Muhammad as a prophet is another unifying clue to the ideology.

Perhaps since they are willing to kill people, as they did in Afghanistan when Korans were found being burned because they had been defaced by Muslims using them to pass messages—and the proper remedy for defaced Korans is to destroy them like that—but nonetheless, they killed people because they didn't like Americans—people they consider infidels—burning the Korans that were defaced by Muslims.

These seem to be clues that keep bringing us back to the fact that the most evil people in our world today appear to claim radical Islam as their ideology, and I know there are Muslim Brothers who have made clear they want a caliphate.

One of the top advisers in the Homeland Security Department here tweeted out back last August, I believe it was, that the caliphate is inevitable, so people just need to get used to the idea. In fact, as I understand it, he put together a long message in recent days that went on a tear after Christians and, as I understand, basically pointing out that maybe the Islamists should be called evangelical Islamists.

Well, that has a different meaning, and I am sure Mr. Elibiary doesn't quite understand the term "evangelical" because evangelical Christian means you bring peace to the world and you introduce them to knowledge of Jesus Christ. You bring them knowledge of Jesus Christ as a man of peace, and you don't kill them if they don't accept Jesus as their savior.

There have been Christians during different historic times in the world that were barbarians and deserved to be put to death for being so barbaric, but the current state of the world is that the most evil people right now are not Christians.

One of my Republican friends and I were talking earlier today. I am a Baptist. When a Baptist church, Westboro or any other, does things that are really despicable, we call them out. My friend was Catholic. He said that if the Catholic church does something improper, he calls them out.

We also understand that there is a reluctance among moderate Muslims to

stand up and condemn the ideology of radical Islam that is so barbaric because they know that if they do that, they shoot to the top of the hit list of people to be taken out. They understand that.

They become horrific apostates in the eyes of radical Islamists and should be taken out, in the minds that are so marred by this evil radical Islamic thinking that would allow someone to have their head jaggedly cut off or to be put in a cage and set on fire.

To whom much is given, of them much is required. For those who believe the teaching of the Bible, we believe that.

We are going to have the President's National Prayer Breakfast Thursday morning. There should be people from over 140 or 150 countries there, and that is one time I am greatly appreciative of the President's espoused faith. We can put politics aside. We are supposed to. We did last year while I was co-chair. JANICE HAHN was cochair.

We can thank God. Radical Islamists can't put aside their evil ideology because they want to force it upon everyone, and they are not going to rest until they are dead and they take as many of what they call infidels with them as possible.

So it shouldn't have been a big surprise to see this story from Breitbart:

ISIS members marched into a Syrian town Friday demanding that all crosses be removed from the churches or have the buildings be completely destroyed.

That is according to the Assyrian Patriotic Party.

Two trucks carrying 20 armed ISIS members stormed into the predominantly Assyrian town of Tel Hormizd in Hassakeh and forced the residents to remove the cross from the main church tower. Hassakeh, an area made up of five Assyrian villages, is located on the Khabur River.

That is radical Islamic ideology, Mr. Speaker, for those in this town who are not aware; but I guess if you are part of this administration, you shouldn't consider that to be all that radical because this administration, under their watch, with Commander in Chief Barack Obama, had orders given to remove crosses from the chapels on our military installations.

So maybe—is it possible—radical Islamists could just be following the example that was set by the top commander in our United States military that we want the crosses removed from our chapels?

Well, unfortunately, the radical Islamists in the Middle East go further. They want all Americans dead. They want all Jews dead. They want Israel wiped off the map. They want the United States, as the great Satan, to become a caliphate, paying homage to their choice of leaders, not ours.

That is an affront to the Constitution, and anyone who has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution should fight shari'a law supplanting our Constitution.

I was also talking today with someone who works with victims in Nigeria.

Boko Haram remains not only unapologetic for the death, torture, and suffering that they have caused to Christians in Nigeria, but they are emboldened. No one from the United States with power to stop them has lifted a finger, other than to tweet: "Bring back our girls."

Having been over there, talking to victims' families—I had it reaffirmed today—the Twitter campaign that was started by this administration against Boko Haram has not been effective. Again, they have been emboldened.

I was advised that there are Christian children in northeast Nigeria who haven't been to school for 2 years because they know that if they do, they will be killed. If they are boys, they will be killed. If they are girls, they will normally be made sex slaves or sold into sex slavery or made into wives who are basically slaves. They are told to convert or be killed.

In meeting with parents, whose hearts are broken, they have heard that the United States is the most powerful country in the world, but they don't know that because they can't understand, if the United States is so powerful—and if it was powerful and good and not evil like Boko Haram—then why wouldn't we lend something more than a tweet to stop the evil.

I also did note that there is a story of French planes helping with intelligence on the Nigerian border. That is encouraging.

The United States does not have to send boots on the ground to Nigeria in order to help defeat Boko Haram. Yes, I understand from people I know and respect in Nigeria that Boko Haram has infiltrated the main government, so it is hard to do anything effectively as the Nigerian Government, with Boko Haram becoming more and more powerful each week.

But because this country has been given so much, if we don't lend a helping hand to stop the most evil entities and people in the world, there will be American lives lost in big numbers in this country, and it is not going to be in the distant future.

In Africa, if Boko Haram takes over Nigeria, as they are well on their way toward pushing to do, then no Christian and no Jew in all of Africa is safe. In fact, they will seek to help establish that caliphate that the Obama adviser in Homeland Security had tweeted out last summer was inevitable.

Well, if Boko Haram is not stopped, they will be inevitable in Africa. Radical Islam—that ideology the President is not familiar with—that radical Islamism will take over Africa.

God bless the Egyptians. They stood up against the Muslim Brothers. The Muslim Brotherhood, by the way, has been labeled as a terrorist organization.

□ 1900

CAIR is part of the Muslim Brotherhood. Some countries consider CAIR to be a radical Islamic terrorist organiza-

tion, but not here in America because the President relies on them for advice.

The Muslim Brotherhood, in the United States, has not been labeled a terrorist organization, like it has in our ally, the UAE, Egypt, other places because, here in the United States, the Muslim Brothers' leaders are sought for advice by this administration.

If we don't stand up against radical Islam—as President Bush talked about, I would rather stop it over there than have to stop it here. Well, it is here. There are cells here. There are people who have been radicalized here.

There are people who have been born here, like al-Awlaki, who have their American citizen passport, and they have grown up hating America from wherever they were raised, and they have free access in and out of the United States because their parents, or at least their mother, came here.

I thought a few years ago it would be years before we saw that kind of effect here. But we know al-Awlaki, whom the President blew up with a drone in Yemen, was helpful in radicalizing people here.

Although the President is not familiar with the ideology that was at work at Fort Hood in that act of war at Fort Hood, the act of war in killing a military recruiter in Arkansas, the acts of war that have been taking place as they did in Boston, it is radical Islam.

And yes, you don't have to qualify that. We understand that most Muslims do not believe in radical Islam. We got that. We don't need the qualifier every time something is said about radical Islam. We get it. But radical Islam should be identified for what it is.

It breaks my heart to say it, but it is a fact. If we don't do more to stop radical Islam in the world, there are large numbers of Americans that are going to die that don't have to. It doesn't have to happen.

But we have to have an administration wake up to the danger that faces the world's Christians and Jews, and people who believe in democracy and who believe in representative government, and not shari'a law; because if we don't act as leaders on the world stage and positively point out, that is radical Islam, and we are going to stop radical Islam—and the moderates of the world understand we are not talking about them. They understand radical Islam is a threat to them and their lives if they stand up against it. They get that.

But I have met moderate Muslims around the world who are willing to lay down their lives because they don't want radical Islamists controlling their country, and they hope, and they do pray, that the United States will wake up and recognize what ideology the President knows not of, and finally see it is radical Islam, and we are going to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE MINDLESS, HEARTLESS EVIL OF ISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I fear more for America than that, as a country, we might allow ourselves to grow numb to human atrocity in our own country and across the world.

Eight years ago, President George Bush warned that: "To begin withdrawing before our commanders tell us we are ready would mean surrendering the future of Iraq."

He said: "It would mean that we would be risking mass killings on a horrific scale. It would mean increasing the probability that American troops would have to return at some later date to confront an enemy that is even more dangerous."

Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress warned President Obama, both in a private letter and in open declaration, of the danger that ISIS represented as it began to rise in Iraq.

We also warned the President that negotiating with terrorists by trading high-level Taliban leaders would lead to an increase in terrorists trying to leverage America and the world by taking hostages. Yet, this President ignored this, and so many other commonsense warnings, and atrocity after atrocity has occurred since.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the world watched in abject horror as 26-year old Jordanian pilot, 1st Lieutenant al-Kaseasbeh, who was taken captive by ISIS, was doused in gasoline, placed in a cage, and burned alive.

Mr. Speaker, this horrifying tragedy is the natural end to the timorous policy of appeasing or negotiating with or neglecting to have a just response to this mindless, heartless evil cancer called ISIS.

And the question occurs: When will this President respond decisively to this hellish evil?

Will it take a direct attack on American shopping malls?

Will it take a direct attack on an American grocery store or a school or an American magazine or some other venue where American blood will have to be spilled before this President calls the evil of global jihad for what it is?

It has been a full year since ISIS retook Fallujah and wiped out America's blood-bought gains. It has been a full 7 months since 55 of my colleagues and I beseeched the President to prioritize security and humanitarian support for religious minorities in Iraq, including the Yazidi people, a group that has now been nearly wiped out completely by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, this administration can no longer claim ignorance. This Nation is at war with Islamist groups like ISIS that support and perpetrate the terrorism of global jihad. Terrorists understand it all too well. The American

people understand it all too well, and it is time that this White House begin to understand it as well.

Mr. Speaker, if the Obama administration continues to sit on the sidelines and allows this unspeakable act of terrorism we have all witnessed today to go unanswered, as it has so many times before, we invite that sinister malevolence to our own shores.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JUDY CHU of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

293. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for General Service Fluorescent Lamps and Incandescent Reflector Lamps [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-STD-0006] (RIN: 1904-AC43) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

294. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Automatic Commercial Ice Makers [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-STD-0037] (RIN: 1904-AC39) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

295. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-123, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

296. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-128, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

297. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-080, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

298. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-113, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-130, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-137, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-127, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

302. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-106, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determinations, certifications, and notifications, pursuant to the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA), sections 1244(c)(1), 1246(a)(1), and 1247(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

304. A letter from the Director, Mississippi River Commission, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the annual report, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, for the Mississippi River Commission covering the calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

305. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30990; Amdt. No.: 3619] received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

306. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1058; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-18053; AD 2014-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

307. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0582; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-065-AD; Amendment 39-18060; AD 2014-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

308. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0526; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-18061; AD 2014-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

309. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Régional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0530; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-062-AD; Amendment 39-18057; AD 2014-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

310. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0626; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-017-AD; Amendment 39-18058; AD 2014-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

311. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30991; Amdt. No.: 3620] received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

312. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30992; Amdt. No.: 3621] received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 78. Resolution Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-14). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KLINE (for himself and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 5. A bill to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 666. A bill to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. JONES, Mr. AMASH, Mr. REED, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TITUS, Mr. FARR, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 667. A bill to authorize Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers to provide recommendations and opinions to veterans regarding participation in State marijuana programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 668. A bill to make clear that an agency outside of the Department of Health and Human Services may not designate, appoint, or employ special consultants, fellows, or other employees under subsection (f) or (g) of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 669. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the period of time for which a conditional permit to land temporarily may be granted to an alien crewman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 670. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the Medicaid rules regarding supplemental needs trusts for Medicaid beneficiaries to trusts established by those beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. HAHN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. McCOLLUM, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. O'Rourke,

Mr. BEYER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SIREs, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Mr. FARR, Mr. BERA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. McNERNEY):

H.R. 671. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Freedom Riders, collectively, in recognition of their unique contribution to Civil Rights, which inspired a revolutionary movement for equality in interstate travel; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 672. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BARR, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 673. A bill to hold the salaries of Members of a House of Congress in escrow if the House of Congress does not agree to a budget resolution or pass regular appropriation bills on a timely basis during a Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 674. A bill to require Amtrak to propose a pet policy that allows passengers to transport domesticated cats and dogs on certain Amtrak trains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 675. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2015, the rates of compensation

for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 676. A bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance coverage for all United States residents, improved health care delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustments to be made automatically by law each year in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 678. A bill to promote the use of blended learning in classrooms across America; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 679. A bill to establish a Road Usage Charge Pilot Program to study mileage-based fee systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax on gasoline, diesel, and kerosene fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RENACCI, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 681. A bill to make certain luggage and travel articles eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFazio (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 682. A bill to withdraw certain land located in Curry County and Josephine County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 683. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from hiring new employees to enforce any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BASS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. FUDGE):

H.R. 684. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 regarding the disparagement of Native American persons or peoples through marks that use the term "redskin", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FINCHER):

H.R. 685. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 686. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa):

H.R. 687. A bill to prevent States and local jurisdictions from interfering with the production and distribution of agricultural products in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 688. A bill to reduce the rate of pay for Members of Congress by 10 percent and to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 689. A bill to permit periodic public reporting by electronic communications providers and remote computer service providers of certain estimates pertaining to requests or demands by Federal agencies under the provisions of certain surveillance laws where disclosure of such estimates is, or may be, otherwise prohibited by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 690. A bill to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 691. A bill to promote the provision of telehealth by establishing a Federal standard for telehealth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BLUM, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BARR, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLORES, Mr. YODER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 692. A bill to ensure the payment of interest and principal of the debt of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia):

H.R. 693. A bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 694. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing hazardous humanitarian services in West Africa to combat the spread of the Ebola virus outbreak shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 695. A bill to address the bark beetle epidemic, drought, deteriorating forest health conditions, and high risk of wildfires on National Forest System land and land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management by expanding authorities established in the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003 to provide emergency measures for

high-risk areas identified by such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 696. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude customary prompt pay discounts from manufacturers to wholesalers from the average sales price for drugs and biologicals under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988 to conserve elephants while appropriately regulating ivory in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution requiring that each agency and department's funding is justified; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the radical Islamic movement in Afghanistan known as the Taliban should be recognized officially as a foreign terrorist organization by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 77. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 79. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Rules in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H. Res. 80. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Judiciary in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 81. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H. Res. 82. A resolution calling on schools and State and local educational agencies to recognize that dyslexia has significant educational implications that must be addressed; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 83. A resolution recognizing the security challenges of convening government officials in one specific place and directing the House of Representatives to take appropriate steps so that the House of Representatives can meet in a virtual setting; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall with-

in the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Res. 84. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H. Res. 85. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. PERLMUTTER introduced a bill (H.R. 698) for the relief of Arturo Hernandez-Garcia; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 5.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign nations . . ."

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have the Power to provide for the . . . general welfare of the United State. . . ." This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, clause 7, "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec 8, Clause 4

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14; and including, but not solely limited to the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, commonly referred to as the Commerce Clause. The Commerce Clause states that the Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. This bill changes U.S. trade

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' powers to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LOEBACK:

H.R. 688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 6 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper from carrying into Execution from foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department of Officer thereof."

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 2 of the United States Constitution, which confer on Congress the power to collect and manage revenue for the payment of debts owed by the United States and to borrow money on the credit of the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 2 United States Constitution:

"The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imports and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on credit of the United States;"

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress authority to make "all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 clause 2 United States Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. PERRY:

H.J. Res. 28.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 21: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 24: Mr. BUCK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 94: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 109: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 131: Mr. MESSER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 139: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 143: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 158: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 167: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 169: Mr. WALZ and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 174: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 188: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 217: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 228: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 232: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 249: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 281: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 287: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 310: Mr. KLINE and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 313: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 317: Mr. BEYER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 370: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 383: Mr. LATTA and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 386: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 387: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 388: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 400: Mr. TROTT and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 408: Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 427: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 443: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 448: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 449: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 451: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 452: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 456: Mr. POCAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 489: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 508: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 525: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 529: Mr. KLINE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HILL, and Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 531: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 532: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 541: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 546: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 554: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 555: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BOST, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 556: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 563: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 578: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 581: Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 583: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 584: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 588: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 589: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 592: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 594: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 595: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 596: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 601: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JONES, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LONG, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 608: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 609: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 612: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. GARRETT.

- H.R. 620: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 629: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 630: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 634: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 635: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 636: Mr. BLUM, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 637: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. REED.
H.R. 638: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 640: Mr. REED and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 644: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 652: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 654: Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 661: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 664: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 665: Mr. GIBSON and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H. Res. 17: Mr. RIBBLE.
H. Res. 28: Mr. HONDA and Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 32: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 54: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 62: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 64: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 67: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 74: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. LANGEVIN.